

**The Life and Times of
Nelson Dingley, Jr**



EDWARD NELSON DINGLEY


The Life and Times of Nelson Dingley, Jr


The author of this book is a well-known and widely respected authority on the life and times of Nelson Dingley, Jr. This work is an early (individual or corporate) as a member of the staff of the United States House of Representatives. The author is a well-known and widely respected authority on the life and times of Nelson Dingley, Jr. This work is an early (individual or corporate) as a member of the staff of the United States House of Representatives.

This book is a well-known and widely respected authority on the life and times of Nelson Dingley, Jr. This work is an early (individual or corporate) as a member of the staff of the United States House of Representatives. The author is a well-known and widely respected authority on the life and times of Nelson Dingley, Jr. This work is an early (individual or corporate) as a member of the staff of the United States House of Representatives.

You are holding a reproduction of an original work that is in the public domain in the United States of America, and possibly other countries. You may freely copy and distribute this work as no entity (individual or corporate) has a copyright on the body of the work. This book may contain prior copyright references, and library stamps (as most of these works were scanned from library copies). These have been scanned and retained as part of the historical artifact.

This book may have occasional imperfections such as missing or blurred pages, poor pictures, errant marks, etc. that were either part of the original artifact, or were introduced by the scanning process. We believe this work is culturally important, and despite the imperfections, have elected to bring it back into print as part of our continuing commitment to the preservation of printed works worldwide. We appreciate your understanding of the imperfections in the preservation process, and hope you enjoy this valuable book.





Nelson Dingley Jr

THE
LIFE AND TIMES
OF
NELSON DINGLEY, Jr.


12374
BY HIS SON
EDWARD NELSON DINGLEY

ILLUSTRATED

PUBLISHED BY SUBSCRIPTION

KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN
IHLLING BROS. & EVERARD
1909


L. C. Dup.
Order Div.



Copyright, 1902.
BY EDWARD NELSON DINGLEY.

By transfer

OCT 8 1914



EXCHANGES

3188
7288

CONTENTS.

	Page.
CHAPTER I.	
Birth—Childhood—Attending School—Early Interest in Politics and Temperance—Teaching School.	1
CHAPTER II.	
At Waterville Academy—Debating Society—Early Political Activity—Entered Waterville College	15
CHAPTER III.	
A Freshman—Interest in Religion—A Local Political Leader—Twenty-one Years of Age—Left Waterville College—Entered Dartmouth College—A Leader in College—First Newspaper Work—Graduated From College.	23
CHAPTER IV.	
Studying Law—Editor of Lewiston Journal—First Speech—First and Only Law Case—A Western Trip—Marriage—Purchased Half Interest in and Later all of Lewiston Journal—Activity in Politics—On the Stump.	35
CHAPTER V.	
The Civil War—The Daily Journal Launched—Elected State Representative—Re-elected—Chosen Speaker of the House.	55
CHAPTER VI.	
The Kingfield Riot—Re-elected State Representative—Visits the Army at the Front—Re-elected Speaker of the House—On the Stump for Lincoln and Johnson—Re-elected State Representative—Leader of the House—Candidate for Congress—Interview with Grant.	70
CHAPTER VII.	
Re-elected State Representative—Again a Candidate for Congress—Active in the Lecture Field—Death of His Mother—On the Stump—Elected State Representative for the Sixth Time.	87
CHAPTER VIII.	
Elected Governor Two Terms Successively—Laws Taxing Railroads—Amending State Constitution.	101
CHAPTER IX.	
Member of the Brooklyn Council in Beecher Case—Head of Maine Delegation to Republican National Convention—Advocate of Temperance and Prohibition.	123
CHAPTER X.	
Fighting Greenbackism—Fusion Victory—A Trip Abroad in Search of Health.	134
CHAPTER XI.	
Attempt to Count Out Republican Officials—Excitement at Augusta—Indignation Meetings—The State Under Martial Law—Two Legislatures—Decision of Court.	145

	Page
CHAPTER XII.	
Active in Politics and Editorial work—Urged Blaine to Enter Garfield's Cabinet—Supported Frye for United States Senator—Elected to Lower House of Congress	120
CHAPTER XIII.	
In the Forty-Seventh Congress—Interest in Shipping, Currency, Banking and Tariff—Member of Shipping Commission.	126
CHAPTER XIV.	
In the Forty-Eighth Congress—The Shipping Bill—The Tariff Bill—At Republican National Convention—Promoted Blaine's Nomination—Western Stumping Tour—Sorrow Over Blaine's Defeat.	221
CHAPTER XV.	
In the Forty-Ninth Congress—Legislative Reunion at Augusta—Shipping Bill—The Fisheries—Opposed Morrison Tariff Bill—Active in Temperance Movements.	261
CHAPTER XVI.	
In the Fiftieth Congress—The Fisheries Treaty—Opposed the Mills Tariff Bill—On the Stump—Centennial Address at His Birthplace, Durham, Maine.	266
CHAPTER XVII.	
In the Fifty-First Congress—Excitement Over Counting a Quorum—Active in Framing Tariff Bill—Opposition to Free Silver.	315
CHAPTER XVIII.	
In the Fifty-Second Congress—Regret Over Blaine's Failure to Secure Presidential Nomination—Defends McKinley Tariff—Prophesies McKinley's Nomination for President—Sorrow Over Death of Blaine—Travels in Europe.	340
CHAPTER XIX.	
In Fifty-Third Congress—Put Forward to Stem the Tide of Free Silver—Leads Opposition to Wilson Tariff—Given Degree of LL. D. by Dartmouth College—Author of an Historical Document.	364
CHAPTER XX.	
In Fifty-Fourth Congress—The Bayard Episode—Made Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee—Leader on the Floor of the House—Arresting the National Deficit—Fighting the Free Silver Amendment to Bond Bill—Steering the Cuban Resolution—His Comment on William McKinley's Nomination for President—A Western Stumping Tour—Summoned to Canton, Ohio.	383
CHAPTER XXI.	
Tendered Portfolio of Secretary of the Treasury—Declined the Honor—Preparation of the Dingley Tariff Bill Begun—His Arduous Work on the Committee—Extra Session of Congress—The Dingley Tariff Bill in House—Opened the Debate—Passed the House	410
CHAPTER XXII.	
Dingley Tariff Bill Amended in the Senate—In Conference—Senate Yielded on All Important Points—Conference Agreement Reported and Adopted—President McKinley Signed the Bill and it Became a Law—Congratulations—Death of Mr. Dingley's Father—Dingley Tariff Law Well Received—Addressed Home Market Club, Boston.	480
CHAPTER XXIII.	
Restored Public Confidence—Fighting Free Silver Coinage—His Appeal to the House to Stand by the Nation's Honor—Excitement Over Blowing	

Up of the War Ship Maine—Reported Bill "For National Defense"—Conference with the President Over Probable War—Assisted President McKinley in Checking the War Cry—War Declared—Master of the House—Preparation of War Revenue Bill Begun—His Skill in Piloting the Bill—Final Triumph Over Opposition—A Vindication.	Page 448
--	-------------

CHAPTER XXIV.

The Joint High Commission—Received an Ovation the Opening Day of Congress—He Forecasts the Policy of Expansion—His Last Address—Taken Ill—A Nation's Anxiety—Heroic Struggle for Life—His Death—Universal Sorrow—An Imposing Funeral—Tributes of Praise—At Rest.	460
--	-----

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

Nelson Dingley, Jr.—Frontispiece.

William McKinley, Jr.

Thomas B. Reed.

Lyman J. Gage.

John D. Long.

Waterville Academy—Prof. J. H. Hanson—Waterville College, Maine.

Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire.

Letter of recommendation from Edwin D. Sanborn.

Nelson Dingley Jr., 1885—A student at Dartmouth College.

Lot M. Morrill—Samuel Wells—Abner Coburn.

Samuel Cony—Israel Washburn—Hannibal Hamlin—Sidney Perham.

Nelson Dingley, Jr., 1874-5, Governor of Maine.

Maine State Capitol—Residence of James G. Blaine, Augusta, Maine.

Joshua L. Chamberlain—Daniel F. Davis—Alonso Carcelon—Selden Connor—
H. M. Fiske.

Forged election returns.

Nelson Dingley, Jr.—1881. Member of Congress.

Hamilton House, Washington, D. C.—Summer Home, Squirrel Island, Maine
—Lewiston, Maine, home, while Governor—Lewiston, Maine, home while member
of Congress.

U. S. Grant—W. E. Rosecrans—N. P. Banks—Joseph Wheeler.

James A. Garfield—Chester A. Arthur—Roscoe Conkling—J. Warren Keifer.

W. H. Morrison—Abram S. Hewitt—Hilary A. Herbert—Wm. M. Springer.

R. B. Hayes—W. W. Phelps—W. E. Holman—John A. Kasson.

J. G. Carlisle—Chas. H. Crisp—Joseph McKenna—Benjamin Butterworth.

Grover Cleveland—W. L. Wilson—J. D. Richardson—J. C. S. Blackburn.

Wm. McKinley—Chas. H. Grosvenor—J. B. Henderson—J. G. Cannon.

H. C. Lodge—R. R. Hitt—J. C. Burrows—Benton McMillin.

John D. Long—A. J. Hopkins—John Dalsell—Amos J. Cummings.

W. J. Bryan—Jerry Simpson—W. P. Hepburn—C. A. Russell.

D. B. Henderson—S. E. Payne—J. A. Tawney—J. P. Dolliver.

Letter to President McKinley declining position of Secretary of Treasury.

Maine's Big Six—Wm. P. Frye—Eugene Hale—Nelson Dingley, Jr.—Thomas B. Reed—Charles A. Boutelle—Seth L. Milliken.

National House of Representatives.

Room of Committee on Ways and Means.

Nelson Dingley Jr., Chairman of Committee on Ways and Means.

International Commission, Quebec, August, 1896.

Steamer "Governor Dingley," Portland Steamship Company.

Robert Dingley—R. Dingley, Esq.—Tomb of Francis Dingley.

Tomb of Francis Dingley and his wife.

Crest of Francis Dingley.

Residence of Rev. Samuel Dingley—Brass of Margaret Dingley—Chariton Manor.

Dingley Homestead, Durham, Maine—Mr. Dingley's mother—Mr. Dingley's father—Lambert Homestead, Durham, Maine where Nelson Dingley, Jr., was born.

Mrs. Salome Dingley, Wife of Nelson Dingley, Jr.

Frank L. Dingley, Brother of Nelson Dingley, Jr.

Garcelon's Ferry, Androscoggin River—Resting Place of Nelson Dingley, Jr., Auburn, Maine—Old Dingley Burying Ground, Durham, Maine.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

To my dear mother, the devoted and loving wife of Nelson Dingley, Jr., and to my wife who has given me encouragement and inspiration, this volume is affectionately dedicated. In compiling and preparing this work for the family, relatives and friends of Mr. Dingley, and for all others who may be interested in reading the story of his singularly pure, upright, useful and christian life, I have endeavored to confine myself to a simple statement of facts, which was the chief characteristic of Mr. Dingley's career. His editorials, speeches and addresses were models of simplicity. He never sacrificed logic and force for needless phraseology. I have also endeavored to bring out what I deemed the salient points of his life—his industry, perseverance, studious habits, rare modesty and christian character. His earthly life was a well rounded career—consistent, wholesome, calm and forcible. It was a lofty example of devotion, unselfishness and earnestness. As a husband and father he was all that mortal can hope to attain. As a public man he was filled with a spirit of patriotism, honesty and sincerity. He was an ideal christian statesman; and his work is a monument more enduring than marble. He is enshrined in the hearts and the minds of a loving people. His career was like the building of a splendid structure—a process of slow but substantial growth and development.

I wish to thank all to whom I am indebted in the preparation of these volumes, and I also wish to acknowledge that I have freely drawn upon published books and documents for suggestions. If this story of "The Life and Times of Nelson Dingley Jr.," is an in-


aspiration to any of these kind friends, they may be comforted with the thought that they contributed to it.

The story of this remarkable life may be a help to those who are almost persuaded that it is impossible in these strenuous days to enter a career of public service without surrendering principle, honesty and sincerity. Mr. Dingley's public life proves that a man can be honest and at the same time a politician—a devout christian and at the same time a practical statesman. If it is true that none but the unscrupulous succeed in public life, then there is indeed danger to our Republic. But the public life of Mr. Dingley, pure and spotless, proves the contrary. The noble and christian people who are in a majority, are ready and anxious to crown him who, by his conduct, precept and example, led the way to a higher and nobler citizenship, a loftier conception of life itself.

The world was made better by the life of Nelson Dingley Jr., and his deeds live after him.

I trust that this volume will prompt a further study of the public life of Mr. Dingley, for the more minutely it is examined the larger and more substantial it grows. Time alone will reveal the fullness and grandeur of his life and his great service to his country and to mankind. As Stanton said of Lincoln—"He belongs to the ages."

E. N. D.





* * * We met for the first time in the Forty-seventh Congress. He took a prominent place almost from the start which he strengthened with every session of Congress. He was a leader of the House even before he became Chairman of Ways and Means. He was a wonderful encyclopedia of facts. His success can be largely attributed to his thorough knowledge of the important subjects of national legislation. He never advocated a cause without strengthening it; he never discussed a public question without illuminating it. He enjoyed in the highest degree the confidence of his party associates and his integrity was always accepted even by those who differed from him. He spoke to his subject, and

addressed his arguments to the members whose judgment he sought to influence. He never spoke for applause.

He was efficient. He had a habit of passing his bills; and while I have made no examination of it, I cannot be far wrong when I state that during his term of service, he placed upon the statute books more important laws than probably any of his contemporaries.

William M. Thayer



The eminent and conspicuous fitness of Governor Dingley for the great position he held at the time of his death was strikingly shown by the complete acquiescence with which his appointment was received by his colleagues and by the people of the country.

At the time he was made Chairman of Ways and Means, Maine had already the Speakership, the Chairmanship of the Naval Committee and that of Public Buildings with just four members for her representation. Had the appointment been an ordinary one, much adverse criticism would have been deserved and encountered; but the feeling was so strong that the fitting thing had been done that nothing but high praise was manifest.

This new position was under the circumstances of that time the most laborious and in many ways the most important in the gift of the Government.

Governor Dingley brought to his new task the powers of a singularly keen intellect well trained as to details as well as a remarkable capacity for long sustained labor. Whatever he undertook to know he mastered to the minutest particulars. It was a satisfaction in private conversation as well as in public speech to hear him explain an involved and difficult question. It was so evident from the very beginning that he had worked over the whole subject that you very readily trusted his knowledge for the matters you did not yourself know.


While he had few of the graces of oratory, no dominating voice, he had very soon after his arrival in Washington the attention of a constantly increasing number of the members of the House until at last he attained the rare distinction of being always listened to because he always had something to say that all wanted to hear.


It is difficult for me in so short a space to express suitable appreciation of the services Governor Dingley rendered his country. Fortunately all know them and any short review could only be a reminder and not a statement

As an adviser in times of stress his wisdom and experience were of great value, all the greater because he was invariably cool and collected, seldom or never disturbed, able at all times to see questions from all standpoints and never deluded by his own wishes and hopes.

Without detracting in any way from the claims of the eminent man who participated in the making of the last Tariff Act it is little enough to say that that act owes its most important features in scope and plan to the skill and wisdom of Governor Dingley, and its details in large measure to his untiring labor.

That the loss of Governor Dingley was a great national misfortune, the people of this country have so fully and amply testified that all any one of us can add seems superfluous.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "T. B. Reed". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping loop at the end of the last name.





My acquaintance with Nelson Dingley was only for a small part of the long time he gave to the public service, but he being Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, as Secretary of the Treasury I had abundant opportunity to know him and to learn his worth. He was singularly gifted in having a broad and comprehensive grasp of public questions, particularly those having relation to the Treasury Department. There was no part of the great field covered by it with which he was not readily familiar. He was especially informed on all subjects affecting national taxation, the public debt, and coinage, banking and currency. He was an ideal man for Chairman of the important committee over which he pre-

sided. The tariff law which bears his name, and the war revenue legislation of 1898, to each of which he gave conspicuously intelligent direction, have met all expectations. The former measure was the first legislative move leading to the season of high prosperity which made the closing years of the century happy ones for the American people. No small part of these great blessings may be credited to the devoted service of Mr. Dingley. The state of the Treasury on the incoming of the administration of President McKinley imperatively demanded a change in the revenue laws. In less than five months the Dingley Bill became effective as a law. No other tariff measure was ever passed so speedily, and none has ever responded to the public needs so adequately and completely. In thirty-five months of its operation it produced a surplus of \$45,000,000. The restoration of public credit thus effected was the foundation upon which was subsequently reared those reforms which have secured to us the happy conditions of the present time. Mr. Dingley's untimely death furnishes one of those sad instances where a faithful public servant did not live to see the full fruition of his hopes and efforts, but if it be true that,

"To live in hearts we leave behind
Is not to die,"


it is also true that we survive in the deeds we have done. They are imperishable and in this sense the one who has gone lives on amid the things he accomplished when he was among us.

A large, elegant handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "Lyman J. Dingley". The signature is written in a cursive style with long, flowing loops and a prominent initial "L".



* * * My memory goes back to the time when he entered public life and when, having made himself known all over the State as the editor of the Lewiston Journal entered the State Legislature, was Speaker of its House of Representatives and afterwards became Governor of the State of Maine. Had he taken no further step in the public service he would still be remembered as one of its most distinguished citizens. But his long career in the National House of Representatives made him a national figure. I do not believe he was ever excelled in industry and in the mastery of all subjects pertaining to the legislation of his country. He always seemed to be an encyclopedia. With none of the arts of an orator,

yet such was his thorough knowledge of every subject he discussed and the confidence he had inspired that no man on the floor of Congress was listened to with more attention. As Chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means, in which position he died, his name of course is associated with the present operating revenue measure, the results of which are a full treasury, the unlimited credit of the United States, and the bounding prosperity of the industries and business of the country. It is with the highest respect that I beg to add the tribute of my word to his memory.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, featuring a large, stylized initial 'J' followed by a series of loops and a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

THE LIFE AND TIMES
OF
NELSON DINGLEY, JR.

CHAPTER I.

1832—1850.

It was a cold night in mid-winter. The moon looked down on a snow-covered landscape. The horses' hoofs crunched the frost-bitten ground, while the smoke from the farm-house chimneys curled lazily heavenward. The river was covered with a thick coat of ice, and the pine trees looked like sentinels on watch.

It was a typical winter's eve in Maine. Christmas had come and gone; the New Year had been born; but a more important event than all to the village of Durham, was the birth of a child whose life, ere its close, was to be linked with that of humanity and the world.

Astrologers say that all great men are born under lucky stars, and that this accounts for their greatness. Reason says that the stars and the planets in their courses, are the lights on God's altar illuminating the great souls of mothers through whom the Almighty creates in his own image, and gives to the world His devoted followers.

There was no bright star in the east; there was no pilgrimage

of wise men; but it was the nativity of a true son of God. Nature kept her secret and revealed it only when the revelation made manifest His divine plan.

Nelson Dingley Jr. first saw the light of day in his grandfather Lambert's house—a one and a half story cottage farm house situated on the road from Auburn, Maine (then Goff's Corner) to the South West Bend, near the Androscoggin River. Here his mother, Jane Lambert, was born August 6, 1809. Here she passed her childhood and young womanhood. Here his mother and father were married in the early part of 1831, and here his parents made their home for nearly two years after their marriage.

In 1852, Nelson Dingley Jr., then only twenty years of age, thus wrote of his birthplace: "Many a time have I gazed with rapturous pleasure on the scenes of my nativity. How oft when summer—queenly June sat on the throne, have I contemplated the scene of my birth. It was a farm house a story and a half high, painted white, but a few rods from the gentle Androscoggin. Peace and plenty reigned triumphant all around; green fields of grain waived their loaded stalks in the breeze, and all spake of comfort. Yes, it was a farmer's home—the home of my dear, dear mother—where she too was born and reveled in the sports of girlhood—where she was young and thoughtless."

Nelson's father was away from home, engaged in peddling, a large part of these years, and during one of his trips he purchased a farm in Parkman, Piscataquis County, about a mile from the "Corner" so called. In January, 1833, when the thermometer was down to zero, the parents with their infant child in it's mother's arms, journeyed to Parkman, a distance of over a hundred miles, and there established their new home. A two horse team contained all their worldly goods. Two years the father and mother toiled, the former on the farm and the latter in the cottage. In 1835, the father entered into partnership with Isaiah Vickery. They ran a country hotel and store combined, while the good wife and mother, Jane, performed successfully the arduous duties of mistress and landlady of the hotel.

Here Nelson, the son, first attended school; and in his diary he records recollections of those boyhood days. While in school one day he accidentally pushed a slate pencil out of reach in his ear. A physician's services were required to remove the pencil; and Nelson beautifully records the sweet and tender ministrations of his mother. "He who knows not the love of a kind mother has lost the great link of life," he wrote.

While attending school at Parkman he received from his mother the first lessons of accuracy and persistence that characterized his whole life. His mother always took him on her knee before he went to school and compelled him to recite his lesson to her over and over again until he had it perfect. Even in those boyhood days he always did things well.

Young Nelson was not a robust child, but was by no means sickly. He was very much like other boys of his age and records in his brief autobiography that he probably often merited and sometimes received an application of the rod at the hands of his mother.

In the year 1838, when Nelson was seven years old, his parents removed to Unity, Waldo County, a pretty village forty miles west of Parkman on the line of the Maine Central Railroad between Burnham and Belfast. His father conducted a general store, in which everything from molasses to calico was sold; and here Nelson received his first experiences in real life.

It might appear to the casual reader of Nelson's subsequent career, that he was an unusually sober and serious lad; and that he never indulged in the games and sports so common in the childhood of every man. But this is a great mistake. From the time that he was seven years old when he first moved to Unity, until the cares of public life occupied his entire attention, Nelson shared actively in all games, sports and out-door events. He was fond of baseball, and in the pursuits of hunting and fishing, and in them all had the same enthusiasm and zeal that characterized him in his study. Here in this quiet village with its wide-spreading elms, its shaded streets and wholesome atmosphere his whole character was formed; and it was broadened and ennobled by his constant and devoted communion with nature. In his diary he speaks of a stream "to which I often directed my steps with hook and line." When a student at Waterville College ¹ and in a poetic frame of mind, he wrote the following poem on "Sand Brook"—that stream to which when a boy he "often directed his steps with hook and line:"

"There is a place, far, far away
More dear to me than life's bright ray,
Where memory fond loves e'er to dwell
And bring to mind the parting knell.

There is a place 'mid nature's lawn

1—August 21, 1851.

LIFE AND TIMES OF

By sparkling waters drawn along;
 With vale and meadows freely blessed,
 With nature's brightest flowers dressed.

There is a place, I know it well,
 Its joys and beauties, who can tell?
 Where hopes of youth beat strong and high,
 Where life was free from many a sigh.

That place is "Sand Brook" known to me
 By boyish sports and dreams of glee
 By playmates dear to youthful days
 Now far away from manhood's gaze.

The pond that washed the northern bound,
 The stream that flowed the village round,
 Have oft been scenes of anxious looks,
 As finny tribes eyed well my hooks.

* * * * *

Ah who can tell how many a time
 Those scenes of youth have come to mind;
 How oft I've sighed for their return,
 And wondered long at life's changed urn."

The winter following his parents' removal to Unity was an exciting one. It was the year of the famous "Aroostook War." The immediate cause of this war was the "plundering" of timber from the public lands of Maine by trespassers from New Brunswick. To protect the public lands, the legislature appropriated \$800,000 and ordered a draft of ten thousand men. Some of these soldiers passed through Unity on their way to Aroostook; and Nelson's youthful eyes gazed with astonishment upon the loads of huge cannon-balls daily carried by; upon the companies of gaily dressed troops, some of which found quarters and rations at the Dingley home.

In school, Nelson was not precocious, but he was even better than that—industrious, zealous, rich in application, capable in continuous study, faithful to his tasks, conscientious, indeed embodying at that early age those characteristics which made him so useful in later years to both his state and nation. The first book he ever owned was "Olin's Travels"—a series of vivid sketches of travel in

the oldest of the continents. He was only a lad of ten, and yet he took great delight in reading and re-reading the pages of this volume. At the age of twelve he was devouring Gibbon's History of Rome; while Daniel Webster's speeches he read as other boys read the stories of Scott and Dickens.

His first school teacher in Unity was Hon. R. W. Files of Thorndike, a state councillor in 1873 and 1874, when Nelson was Governor of Maine—"A severe disciplinarian who made himself felt in more ways than one," wrote Nelson in after years. Of this school period Nelson wrote in his diary: "Faint shadows flit by now and then of a piece of leather sewed together and stuffed with hair, about a foot in length, which at times performed sundry antics over the backs of delinquent youths."

In the winter of 1840 Mr. Whitney of Thorndike was his teacher; and it is said that Nelson was one of the bright boys of the village, largely due to the extraordinary care bestowed upon him by his mother. On the seventh of February, 1840, Nelson's first and only brother (Frank Lambert) was born. Of this event he wrote later in his diary: "A brother! What magic in the word—another link in the chain of affection that binds man to earth."

Nelson was eight and a half years old when the whole country was aroused over the Presidential contest of 1840 when "Tippecanoe and Tyler too" was the watchword; and he wrote of that period in later years: "I recall even now (1874) an illumination in the village of Unity in honor of Harrison's election."

In the autumn of 1841 he began to master the mysteries of grammar, and he wrote his first composition which was a reproduction of a story he had read. Here it is:

RALPH EDWARD.

"There was a boy who lived in Connecticut. His father was dead and he went to school. One Saturday afternoon he went down to a river which was near, and he saw a boy plunge into the river without taking off his clothes. Soon he began to struggle. Edward took off his boots and hauled the boy on shore. The boy owned that he could not swim and promised that he would not venture into such deep water till he had learned to swim. Edward went home without saying a word and went into his own little chamber and shed tears. His mother went and asked him what was the matter. He said he could not help crying when he thought of that drowning boy."

It was in September 1841 that Nelson experienced his first sorrow, the death of his intimate playmate John Osborne Seavey, son

of the local hotel keeper. For the first time death was brought near to him, and the sad incidents were indelibly engraven on his memory. Of this first grief he wrote: "Death was thus first brought near to me. The funeral services, the last look at the familiar face, the closing of the coffin lid, the procession to the churchyard, the funeral hymn, the last farewells—all these sad incidents are engraven on my memory, and seem as fresh after the lapse of more than thirty years as though it were but yesterday."

During the next three years Nelson attended school, worked on his father's farm, fished and hunted and roamed in the woods and along the streams. Judging from the entries in his diary he did not disturb the fish or game to any great extent, for he was accustomed to lay down his gun or his rod, stretch himself flat upon his back and contemplate the beauties of nature. At thirteen years of age, owing to his rapid growth, he became sickly; but in another year his constitution triumphed and health was restored.

It was about this time that he conceived the first great impulse of education, which led him by twilight and candlelight to snatch every possible moment for books. He was an omnivorous reader. He made his own selections and evinced a distaste for the floating literature of the day and sought works of greater utility—histories, biographies and books of travel. At the age of fifteen he had read historical works comprising the whole world. At the age of twenty he wrote in his diary concerning his literary selections during that period: "Since then, I have seen the wisdom of my choice."

Although only fourteen years old, Nelson began to be, in a sense, a public man. His father was a Whig, and a Whig was a devoted follower of Daniel Webster. The literature of social and political economy was then very lean, and Nelson was obliged to enter original avenues of thought to obtain what he conceived to be the true basis of political economy. Calhoun, Clay and Webster were the only authorities and masters of American politics. With the speeches of Webster which he digested and assimilated, as his starting point, he slowly but surely evolved a practical political economy of his own which was of such great value to him in after years. In 1845, he spent much time in his father's store. Every spare moment while waiting for customers he employed reading some historical work. He had a way of laying down the book every few moments and quizzing himself on what he had read. In this way he strengthened his memory and laid by a store of useful knowledge.

In the winter of this year an incident in his school life happened

that caused him great shame at the time. For turning his head and looking frequently at a girl on the opposite side of the school house who looked captivantly towards his seat, Nelson was sent by the teacher to sit by her side. Of this incident he wrote later: "I was deeply mortified then to receive the punishment, although I have wondered why I did not kiss the rod."

Nelson was early trained in habits of industry and study both by his father and mother. They were hard working people, devoted to their children and ambitious for their welfare. Of his mother, Nelson wrote in later years: "Having naturally marked ability and having received a fair education and had successful experience as a teacher for several years previous to her marriage, she impressed her own love of intellectual pursuits on her children; and early inspired them with an ambition to excel in this direction. Her strong character, marked practical sense, and deep regard for all that is pure and noble, gave to the household an atmosphere which could not fail to produce a lasting impression. To her early and repeated inculcations is due the deep interest which I have felt from childhood in the cause of temperance." Of his father he wrote: "Ever kind and indulgent, although watchful and firm, we owe to him, as well as to dear Mother, that careful training which shielded us from the influence of temptation, made industrious and virtuous conduct a habit, and prepared us so well for the active duties of life."

December 3, 1846, Nelson began a diary and maintained it until within a month of his death. He was almost fifteen years old when he began this record of his life, and on that day he entered a short sketch of the town of Unity and a statement of the local, state and national government. He wrote that "the most of the inhabitants are Democrats. They had a very hard time choosing a representative this fall. The man set up by the Whigs was E. K. Vose of Knox, and by the Democrats W. Weed of Knox, and Abolitionists, S. G. Stevens of Unity. After trying four times the Democrats finally elected W. Weed of Knox. * * * The President of this nation is James K. Polk, Democrat, and the Vice-President is Geo. M. Dallas, Democrat. This nation is now at war with Mexico. So far our soldiers have been victorious. They are commanded by Z. Taylor, an able general."

Thus early Nelson evinced a deep interest in politics. The village statesmen were accustomed in those days to gather around the cracker barrel at his father's store in the summer evenings and settle great questions of State. The guide through those stormy

seas of disputation generally was this lad of fourteen or fifteen, who, when the discussion became hot calmly stated the facts of the case which were usually accepted without question. Thus the youthful oil was poured on the troubled waters.

The cause of temperance was increasing very rapidly in Maine, and Nelson at this age took an active and prominent part. He was a member of the Unity Washingtonian Society, a temperance organization that had its origin in Baltimore in 1840. It spread over the country and had for its chief promoters such men as John H. W. Hawkins, and John B. Gough. Nelson took part in all the discussions and debates in this local temperance society. The first topic was, "Whether alcohol is necessary as a medicine." It is needless to say that the young man stoutly defended the negative. This was the beginning of a long service in behalf of the cause of temperance.

The winter of 1846 and 1847 appears to have been a very busy one for Nelson. Between debates on temperance, studies in the day school and Sunday-school and selling goods at his father's store he found time on December 24, 1846 to engage in a little business on his own account. He took a load of potatoes to the market at Belfast, twenty miles distant, sold them, and returned home with his money next day, much elated over his good bargain. It was his first trip alone away from home, and it was the first time that self-reliance had ever been developed in him among strangers; and instead of being depressed he was encouraged to try other ventures of more importance and greater magnitude.

Nelson was a natural debater; and on January 5 1847 he organized at the school-house, a debating society called "The Unity Lyceum;" and all the important public questions of the day were discussed by the boys who were members. It was in this lyceum that the future statesman and legislator laid the foundation of his forensic career. In the middle of January, 1847, Governor Kent appeared in a case of some importance to the village, and the scholars who were members of this lyceum were dismissed in order that they might hear Gov. Kent make his argument and learn from him what true oratory was at that time. Nelson was an attentive listener.

As further proof of the fact that the future Congressman was, as a boy, the same as all other boys, it may be said that he attended a dancing school that winter and learned the various figures—"the five positions up and back, cross over and back, and the chasse

step," as he recorded in his diary; and tradition says that he was a good dancer.

In the spring of 1847, Nelson, together with his fellows, formed a military company. He was chosen Captain, and the company was the pride of the town. The drills were conducted in his father's pasture. Nelson wrote later of this event that "we did not rest content until we had a general muster with our single company, on which occasion I was promoted to an imaginary Colonelcy, with the command of the field. Undertaking to catch father's horse for the purpose of making an appearance to mount it, I came near receiving a severe kick from the animal; whereupon the attempt to seek military honors was abandoned." Nelson's father had recently bought this horse and he was an animal of a great deal of spirit. The suggestion of putting a saddle on the animal's back was received by the father with a slight twinkle in his eye. But the horse and rider started off in fine fettle, and in about half an hour the horse came snorting back alone. This was somewhat alarming, but the father thought it was possible that the lad had left the horse at the wayside to get a drink at the favorite spring at the foot of the hill, and accordingly waited patiently for the boy's return. In the course of half an hour a sorry looking boy with a bloody handkerchief concealing a somewhat dilapidated nose, walked slowly into the yard, saying: "I'll be darned if I'll ever ride that horse again." It is no wonder that he abandoned all attempts to seek military glory on horseback.

Nelson's experience and success in marketing potatoes at Belfast whetted his appetite for more commercial glory; consequently on July 4, 1847 in company with a playmate he started a peanut, lemonade and cracker stand in the village square, which business venture netted them the large sum of seven dollars. His share was at once invested in books.

During the winter of 1847 and 1848 he progressed rapidly with his studies, and on January 18, the village high school gave a public exhibition. He recited an original poem which unfortunately has not been preserved. He continued in his course of reading and study, took a still more active part in the local debating societies, discussed with the statesmen of the village questions of protection, finance and temperance with a somewhat precocious wisdom born not only of a retentive memory, but of a remarkable aptitude for philosophy, science and logic. The foundations of the great career which was before him were laid deeper and stronger than ever. The science of politics fascinated him as much then as it did in later

years. No political speech, no event of the hustings, no debate in the school hall, no discussion in the postoffice, failed, if he were present, to interest him or to elicit participation on his part, if such seemed to him to be timely.

April 25, 1848 a section of the Cadets of Temperance, known as Litterarius section, was instituted in Unity, and Nelson took an active part in maintaining it. Among the papers left by him, was his original copy of the "Constitution and By-laws of Litterarius Section No. 2 of the Cadets of Temperance of Unity, instituted April 25, 1848—N. Dingley, Jr.—Virtue, Love, and Temperance." In the preface of the constitution are found these words: "The vast utility of this juvenile organization is made apparent by a very superficial examination of its features. By its operations we gather within the folds of a temperance influence, the elements of which society is composed—the embryo men and rulers of this great Republic."

An amusing incident is told of Nelson when he was President of the local Cadets of Temperance of the town of Unity. His younger and only brother, Frank, was also a member of the order, and it was charged that on an occasion not long before that date, the lad was seen to partake of sweet cider, the use of which was prohibited by the constitution and pledge of the Cadets of Temperance. The brother was then perhaps seven or eight years of age. Nelson was perhaps fifteen. The latter invited those making the allegations to formulate their charges and present them before the order in usual form. With great seriousness the investigation proceeded, and in due course, (the arguments being postponed) Nelson undertook an elaborate defence, commenting on the testimony with a great deal of dignity, as though the fate of both lads depended upon the verdict. In speaking of this incident in later years the Congressman said he thought it was possible the respondent was guilty but invoking the principle that the prisoner should have the benefit of the doubt and calling into question the credibility of certain witnesses, who, as he judged seemed to be loaded with prejudice, in a discussion of more than an hour, he laid down the law, the evidence, and the gospel of the situation so forcibly that the jury returned a verdict of "Not Guilty," amid the applause of two or three scores of youngsters who listened attentively to every word. Nelson said in later years that his argument was based upon the fact that in the first place the young assailant of his brother's standing in the Cadets did not know what it was that his brother drank, and secondly that as a matter of fact,

it was not cider but apple juice, cider requiring a certain degree of fermentation. "On fermentation," said Mr. Dingley, with a twinkle, "I came out strong. I buried the hapless boy who had brought the charge under a weight of scientific revelation. I assailed his reputation for veracity and the result was that every vote but one was for acquittal, and that one was cast by the boy who brought the charge. Then brother Frank was led in and triumphantly purged of his contumely." This little incident displayed the capacity for leadership and tact which Nelson early evinced.

As an indication of the standard of social life which was maintained in Maine villages half a century ago, it is interesting to note that on July 9, 1848, Nelson entered into the following "articles of agreement" duly signed and sealed:

ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT

made this day. Know all men by these presents that I will not enter the bowling alley of J. L. Seavey for one month from today, under a penalty of 25 cents. To which I bind myself, my executors, etc. Signed and sealed this ninth day of July, A. D. 1848.

Nelson Dingley Jr. (seal.)

As the bowling alley was evidently a resort for rowdies, it is clear that the mother's advice and the father's injunction to stay away was followed in this case.

Nelson took a deep interest in the fall election of that year, not only because he followed closely all public affairs, but also because his father was nominated for State Senator at Belfast by the Whigs. John W. Dana of Fryeburg was the Democratic candidate for governor and failed to be elected by the people, but was, however, elected by the legislature. Elijah L. Hamlin, of the famous Hamlin family, was the Whig candidate for governor. Samuel Fessenden was the Whig candidate for gubernatorial honors. Abner Curn, afterwards Governor of Maine, was the Whig candidate for Congress in the 5th District. Israel Washburn Jr., of the famous Washburn family, was the Whig candidate for Congress in the sixth District. Elbridge Gerry was the Democratic candidate for Congress in the first District and was elected. Nelson's father was defeated.

Unity was a Democratic stronghold and the Whigs therefore rejoiced all the more over the election of their candidate for President, and Nelson participated in a grand jubilation at Unity over the triumph of Zachariah Taylor in the following November. He recorded the full vote in Unity and the State of Maine in the Presidential election of November 7, 1848. The Town of Unity went

Democratic by 49 plurality, and the State Democratic by 4088 plurality. Taylor, however, received a majority of the electoral votes and was elected, and Nelson recorded in his diary in extra large letters and evidently with exultation:

"Final results of election—Zachariah Taylor, President, Millard Fillmore, Vice-President, from March 4, 1849, to March 4, 1853."

In those days reports of elections came in altogether by post; and the completion of a telegraphic wire across the southern portion of the State of Maine explains the significance of Nelson's statement in his diary November 10, 1848 that "so quick is news circulated by means of the telegraph that the election of Z. Taylor is made certain tonight." And this was three days after the election!

Nelson was sixteen years old when he taught his first school. December 2, 1848, he parted tearfully from his mother and in a cold drizzling rain storm "staged it" to the village of China, four teen miles distant. The old stage coach drew up in front of the house and his mother stood at the door with tears streaming from her eyes. She bade him good-bye, and he passed on. He said in after years that he had the utmost difficulty to keep back the tears and control his feelings on this occasion—the first time that he left his parental roof. After he had taken his seat in the old stage coach and the door closed he broke down in the solitude of his thoughts. During the fourteen mile ride to China, he revolved in his mind the new and untried responsibilities which he was about to undertake, and he determined that for the sake of his mother's tears and his father's love and sympathy, he would acquit himself well; and as the stage rolled on and the rain increased in violence and beat against the window panes he became calm and confident, resolved to overcome every weakness and every obstacle and prove himself worthy of the love and labor bestowed upon him by the most affectionate and faithful of mothers and fathers. Here he taught school for nearly two months, receiving the large sum of \$3.25 per week, boarding around during the entire two months on fried pork and gingerbread furnished in weekly doses by every family in the district. In later years he laughingly said that during this experience he ate three miles of twisted doughnuts.

From the middle of February 1849, to the middle of May 1850, he attended the village school, helped his father in the store, was active in the meetings of the Cadets of Temperance, and altogether a singularly thoughtful and useful boy of seventeen. He took a

deep interest in the State election of 1849, when John Hubbard, Democrat, was elected Governor over Elijah L. Hamlin, Whig, and George F. Talbot, Free Soiler. His father was again the Whig candidate for State Senator in the 5th district, but was defeated. Nelson entered in his diary a detailed statement of the results of the election—in fact all the important events in State and National politics were chronicled by him. To show his deep interest, at this early age, in the progress of the world, note what he wrote January 1, 1850:

"In contemplating the departure of the year 1849, we see the departure of a year of disaster and gloom. The year 1848 was a year of liberty for Europe, but 1849 has crushed their hopes and the monarchs of Europe ride on their thrones in comparative security. But the state of things in Europe shows that there must be a great struggle between the people and the monarchs in which one will entirely gain the ascendancy."

As a further evidence of his intelligent knowledge of current events, the independent attitude of his mind and his interest in the welfare of the people, read what he wrote January 10, 1850, when he was only eighteen years old:

"An avowal of my belief in the general government—how I should vote.

"Motto—Liberty, Union, Equality and the Constitution.

"First it is my belief that I should first consider the capability and honesty of the man to be voted for and not be blinded by regular nominations; that I should be guided in the choice of men by those that have the following principles at heart:

"That a tariff high enough to protect our own industry is an indispensable requisite.

"That the Wilmot Proviso, or no more slave territory is an indispensable thing.

"External and internal improvements for the better carrying on of international trade.

"Cheap postage for the people in order that the 'Press,' liberty's lever, may be better circulated.

"Liberty of speech, of the press, of petition.

"Abolishing of the slave traffic and holding of human beings in slavery in our Nation's Capitol and the District of Columbia."

As a proof of his moral character and his strict regard for temperance and sobriety, even at this early age, it is interesting to read in his diary January 9, 1850—this curious compact:

"Know all men by these presents that we, Nelson Dingley Jr.

and John W. Fernald of Unity, County of Waldo, State of Maine, are holden and bound unto each other in the sum of twenty-five cents to be paid etc. Provided that if the said Dingley shall not drink any tea or coffee, and that the said Fernald shall not use any tobacco for the space of one week; if such is done then it shall be null and void, otherwise in full force etc.

N. Dingley Jr.
J. W. Fernald."

July 3, 1849, was an important day in the life of Nelson and the history of that section, for on that day he witnessed the opening of the railroad connecting the village of Winthrop with Lewiston. This was his first visit to Lewiston where he subsequently resided so many years.

CHAPTER II.

1850—1852.

Nelson had a natural thirst for knowledge and during all these years he was carefully storing his mind with valuable information, thus fitting himself not only for a college but also a national career. May 18, 1850, was a red-letter day in his life. It was then he went to Waterville to attend the Waterville Academy; and of this step he wrote later: "I felt in some measure the value of knowledge and I wished to drink deep at its fountain. As yet I have no settled purpose in mind. It was merely an indefinite desire to prepare myself to fill whatever station Providence might allot to me."

Waterville Academy was a flourishing institution. Nelson thus wrote of it: "The towering walls of brick looked down imposingly on me, as if to remind me of the future. The teacher was a pleasant, energetic man. His name was James H. Hanson; and the time spent with him will endear him to my memory."


Prof. Hanson was one of the most distinguished and successful teachers Maine ever had. He was only thirty-four years old when he was Nelson's instructor. His enthusiasm, untiring devotion to his pupils, capacity for work, and rare character as a christian scholar and gentleman, put this institution among the best equipped and most largely attended secondary schools in New England. He died in 1894; and to him Nelson owed much of his thorough and christian training.

Nelson at once took high rank in his studies; and one of his classmates,¹ wrote that "when Mr. Dingley entered the school he was about eighteen; but his thoughtful, gentlemanly appearance

1—Mrs. J. H. Hanson, widow of Prof. Hanson, 1890.

made him seem much older. His figure and presence were not imposing, but his friendly face, his interest in his work, his quick perception, his conscientious discharge of every requirement, his exceeding accuracy, his tireless industry, his courteous, respectful attitude toward his teachers, soon gave him an enviable reputation in the school. His influence was always on the right side, and there was no blur on the line that marked right from wrong. He refrained from questionable indulgences with no air of 'I am holier than thou,' but with an evident conviction that he could not afford the time taken from things he liked to do better. He did not hesitate to show his decided views in regard to temperance and religion. He did not preach but lived his life in a strong, forceful, serious fashion. With him the courtesies of life were the overflow of a genuine spirit of kindness. To his school-mates he was genial, friendly, helpful and capable. He has left the school as an inheritance, the influence of his method, manners and morals. He showed remarkable capacity for work, and excellence in recitation. In Greek and Latin he knew all the fine print, and it was difficult to find a point he had not examined. In the debating society, which Mr. Dingley with others organized, he was interesting though not brilliant. His clear, simple, logical statements, his command of choice language, his low, well-modulated voice and excellent memory were convincing and impressive. At a gathering of Maine's teachers in Augusta, Me., soon after Mr. Dingley was married, Prof. Hanson asked Mr. Dingley how it happened he was never betrayed into neglecting his studies while at the Academy. He replied: 'I sent my parents every Saturday night a report of my school work and the manner in which I spent my time out of school. I was careful that this report should carry no anxiety or discomfort to my mother to whose instruction and encouragement I owe the ambition I had to attain an education, or to my father, whose kind, firm discipline taught me the value of prompt obedience, fidelity and truth.'

Nelson's correspondence during this period indicates very clearly that his thoughts were high, his ambition great and his hopes buoyant. It appears that he obtained much inspiration and good advice from J. W. Fernald, with whom he made that curious compact to abstain from the use of tea, coffee and tobacco. Young Fernald wrote him April 26, 1850: "I doubt not your whole soul is enlisted in your studies. I thought when I saw you on the day you arrived, your countenance bespoke too close application, though no doubt hundreds to one regret non-application rather



WATERVILLE ACADEMY—PROF. J. H. HANSON.
WATERVILLE COLLEGE, MAINE.

LIBRARY

than close application. With a good share of mental energy, fair intellectual powers, and well established principles, there is no station in our Republican Government, Legislative or Judicial, to which an American need despair of attaining. * * * * When Rome was in her glory it was no small thing to be called a Roman Citizen. It was a sufficient protection. How much more to be called an American Citizen! I have often thought what you have so frequently remarked in regard to our duties; and the means to be used to accomplish the most good—in short what you have often said in observance of the Sabbath Day."

Later in the year young Fernald wrote in reply to Nelson's letter: "You are at the beautiful village of Waterville storing your mind with useful knowledge, preparing yourself to perform your part in the great drama of human life; and I have no doubt you will act your part well. At any rate you have already laid a most permanent foundation on which to build your structure. A young man of your age possessing intellectual capacity governed by principles that shall ever sustain an unblemished character, and feeling his responsibility as a member of a Republican compact, may justly look forward to the attainment of a high position in the scale of human beings and human action. * * * * Cut high your name in the everlasting rock, and when your funeral bell shall toll, a people will say that another of the good and great has gone. This I say, may be your picture, without flattery." Prophetic words!

Nelson's taste for knowledge during this first year at Waterville Academy gave him a desire for more; and although his good father was in humble circumstances, in answer to a letter from the ambitious young student, he replied in this kindly but brief manner:

Unity, July 14, 1850.

Yours of the 12th duly received. As to your inquiry about attending school at Waterville another term, I will say that you can if you want to, but must get along as cheap as you can.

Your Father,

Nelson Dingley.

That year (1850) two important events happened—President Taylor died and Hannibal Hamlin was elected to the U. S. senate. The slavery question was coming to the front, and arousing the people to a high pitch of excitement, and Nelson wrote that "some calamity seems to be impending this Union." June 27, the Free Soil State Convention met in the Town Hall at Waterville and nominated George F. Talbot for Governor. Nelson attended this

convention—his first—and was much interested in its proceedings. There was great excitement in Waterville and Unity and on July 4th, the Unity section of Cadets of Temperance took part in a big procession, and Nelson acted as marshal. The Waterville Mail contained a glowing account of the celebration written by him.

The annual state election took place September 9th, and there was intense excitement over representatives to Congress, and representatives to the State Legislature. The contest was between the two factions of the Democrats, the Wild Cats and the Wool Heads, as they were called. Nelson sympathized with the Wool Heads—the anti-slavery and temperance faction of the Democrats. John Hubbard was elected Governor, and Lot M. Morrill, (who was elected Governor in 1857, 1858 and 1859, later elected U. S. Senator when Hannibal Hamlin was elected Vice-President, and appointed Secretary of the Treasury in 1876-'77,) was the Democratic candidate for Congress in the 3rd district. William Pitt Fessenden, (who was elected U. S. Senator in 1854, 1859 and 1865, was a member of the Peace Congress in 1861, and appointed Secretary of the Treasury to succeed Mr. Chase,) was the Whig and Free Soil candidate for Congress in the 2nd District. Israel Washburn, Maine's first War Governor was the Whig candidate for Congress in the 7th district. Nelson recorded in his diary a complete statement of the result of this election. He wrote that "the result of the late election has been very encouraging to the Whigs, who might with two or three hundred more votes, rightly distributed, have carried five districts in this state for Congress."

Nelson returned to Waterville Academy in the fall of 1850. He turned his attention more than ever to debating, and in September of that year, with others, organized a mock court. Benjamin Kimball was Judge; L. C. Comfort was Clerk; Nelson was Attorney General, and John Jones was Sheriff. Students were frequently tried for alleged crimes in the presence of large audiences. The Philomathean Society met weekly for debate, and Nelson always took part. On the evening of October 8th the question "Did Napoleon Bonaparte do more for the Liberty of France than any other ruler France ever had; and was his expulsion from the throne son was one of the leading speakers on the affirmative side. The question was decided in the negative by a vote of 6 to 7, "after a very good discussion," wrote Nelson philosophically after his defeat. October 22, the lyceum discussed the question: "Would the dissolution of the Union improve the condition of the Free States?" Nelson spoke vigorously and logically on the negative

side, and the decision was in his favor. Nov. 5th, the question "Is slavery a greater evil to mankind than intemperance?" was debated. Nelson took the negative and recorded in his diary these, to him, unanswerable points: "Facts in relation to the monster Intemperance. Intemperance costs the United States 89 million dollars; Great Britain, 200 million dollars; France, 275 million dollars; Sweden, 70 million dollars; and the rest of the world 300 million dollars; total 925 millions. Besides the cost of work-houses, prisons, etc., directly or indirectly caused by intemperance, is two thousand millions. Total cost of intemperance per year about 3000 millions."

Thus Nelson acquired rapidly the art of thinking on his feet, and in these early debates laid the foundation for his remarkable career as a public debater on the platform and in the halls of legislation. He was always candid and fair as well as logical; never oratorical and never abusive. His strength was in his clear-cut and truthful statements. He also mastered the philosophy of the political events in the state and nation and rapidly became an authority in all public matters. He took a deep interest in the anti-slavery struggle and in the debates that preceded it.

About this time Nelson fully made up his mind to enter college. November 9th he wrote: "I think now some of entering college another year if Providence permits. The task looks great; and the expense objectionable. But it may be for my advantage."

It may appear to some that Nelson was a book-worm, never indulging in any of the games and sports prevalent in all academy and college towns. But he was human and very much like his fellow-students and indulged in the good times and the mild pranks that relieved the monotony of the classic atmosphere. He frequently took long walks with his girl school-mates and attended social entertainments. He was not entirely innocent of partaking in the affairs that tried the patience of the professors on exhibition days. But he was always manly and good-natured about it, and always won the love and respect of students and professors.

That winter he taught school at \$20 per month, and as usual boarded around. He attended regularly the meetings of the Cadets of Temperance and took part as a leader in all the local literary events. One feature of the literary club was a paper of which he was editor, full of original and selected matter which was read to the members of the club.

As a teacher, Nelson was a great success. Although always thoughtful and studious, he was also foremost in all sports and

games, and a moral and spiritual example to the boys in his school and the town. He combined the vigorous liveliness of a strong youth with the sober thoughtfulness of a man. Far from being a dreamy bookish fellow, he was a leader in all the romping, hunting and fishing, and withal had time to be foremost in the social life of the place. He was kind hearted and generous and was never too busy to go around to the house of some dull one at night and help him or her with knotty problems. Each pupil in the school somehow felt that the teacher was more interested in him than in anybody else, and worked hard and conscientiously as the result. He frequently called at the houses of the pupils and interested their parents in their progress. One of his scholars now grown to manhood said: "I do not think there was a person in Unity well acquainted with this quiet, unobtrusive but forceful young man who did not comprehend that he had before him a great future."

Nelson became still more interested in politics as the contest over temperance and freedom progressed. On the 10th of March there was a town meeting in Waterville and excitement ran very high. Nelson wrote that "there was a great contest between rum and temperance for selectmen; but temperance conquered. The whole board are temperance men. The rummies are downed."

Early in April he had his first experience as a practical politician, and he entered into the election with his usual zeal and thoroughness. His father was a candidate for selectman; and Nelson distributed votes and took a prominent part in arranging the ticket which prevailed. Of this event he wrote: "There was a great rush but we most signally defeated the Hunkers."

He began his last term at Waterville Academy the latter part of May 1851, and paid the large sum of \$2.00 per week for his board. He had obtained his father's consent to enter Waterville College and on June 5th wrote that "in looking ahead to a college course, it seems to be a long time to spend wholly in the improvement of the mind; but then it soon passes away. Hope, ambition, the thought that some latent germs of greatness may lie concealed, spurs the student on and buoys him up through years of hard study. Webster, Clay, Calhoun, Benton—they were students once, and pursued the same dark road to greatness. Who knows but what these same powers lie in me? Alas, time only can tell. The grave may, before that, claim me for a victim, or deceived, I may wear out my last days in obscurity. But hope, sweet hope, cheers the student on. Knowledge is a road through which all may attain

some object if they will only persevere. It is a gem which will guide the traveler in the dark."

How like a prophet and a sage this boy of nineteen wrote!

Late in July he was examined for Waterville College and passed with high honors. That summer he journeyed to Lewiston, Paris, and the White Mountains, and wrote a glowing account of his trip which was published in the Belfast Signal. On the 10th of September, 1851, he returned to Waterville, and entered the freshman class of Waterville college. Thus he was launched on his college career.

CHAPTER III.

1852—1855.

Waterville College (now Colby University) was founded in 1818 and originally called the "Maine Literary Theological School." Nelson entered the freshman class of this college September 10, 1851, and began his college course with high hopes. He still kept up his historical and biographical reading; and having finished the life of John Quincy Adams, wrote of him: "His life was a life of public service and his death found him at his post." He had many years battled singly (in Congress) for the right of petition and finally came off victorious. As a scholar he had few equals, as a statesman and diplomatist he excelled all, as a patriot governed by the pure principles of virtue, morality, temperance and religion, our country will long strive in vain to fill his place. He died full of years conscious that he had made use of his faculties for the improvement of his fellow-men and uttering as his last words: 'I die in peace, I am content.' Words of great significance to be uttered by a dying mortal. Let all emulate his virtues!"

In addition to his wide reading he was a prolific writer and contributed articles to the literary societies and the local papers, and gave evidence of great literary ability. He wrote not only able articles on all literary topics and current political events, but he composed poetry of no small merit. The original manuscripts of some of these poems have been preserved. But like all young writers his contributions were sometimes rejected; and in this he was not alone. It is said that Thackery's early writings were rejected as worthless while Milton was unable to find a publisher who would risk his name and money in the publication of "Paradise

Lost." The latter part of October Nelson sent a poem to the editor of the Belfast Signal. The editor replied: "Sometime since, I received from you a communication in poetry, and the fact that it was mislaid will account for my not noticing it sooner. The poetry is very good but I must decline to publish it."

Freshmen were in those days very much the same as freshmen are today; and Waterville College had its share of incidents in which the sophomores persecuted the freshmen and made their lives miserable. Nelson with other freshmen was mildly "squibbed" or hazed. These squibbings consisted largely of pouring pails of water from the third story windows on the heads of the unfortunate freshmen or blowing horns under their windows. This year Nelson was one of the victims, but it is not recorded that he refrained from retaliating and indulging in the same thing the succeeding year.

He had scarcely entered upon his college course when he was taken ill. About the middle of October he was stricken with typhoid fever and was taken to his home in Unity where for nine weeks he suffered from the ravages of disease. For several days, at the crisis, his life hung in the balance, and one night his death was hourly expected. He was unconscious and apparently rapidly sinking. His weeping parents stood by, watching over their dear one. His mother, who had constantly remained at his side, uttered a groan of despair which seemed to arouse the sick boy for a moment. That groan, which was really a stifled prayer, seemed to snatch Nelson from the grave. Nature triumphed, and the crisis was passed, but it was ten weeks before he was able to go to his father's store. During this time his fond mother was untiring in her watchful care; and later Nelson recorded in his diary: "For the constant care, anxiety, and watchfulness of mother and father I cannot return an equivalent; but God grant that I may always have in mind that too much kindness cannot be shown them." The first day of March he had recovered his health entirely and returned to college to resume his studies. The sound of the college bell was heard again. His old college friends greeted him; and by their manifestations of interest and devotion touched his affectionate heart.

It was about this time (March 1851) that Nelson identified himself with the "Zeta Psi" fraternity in whose behalf he was active throughout his college course. Of this fraternity he wrote in later years: "The choicest affections of my heart were withdrawn from the world without and thrown around a band of chosen brothers.

A host of friends rose up as if by magic. * * * * Never can I regret that my lot was to be a light which should reflect the beauties and sublimity of the principles of the Zeta Psi Society."

The young student steadily took a more and more serious and thoughtful view of life. He was studious, and yet not a book-worm. He was reflective and yet not morose. His classmates ever noticed his happy disposition and evenly-poised temperament. He seemed to look upon life as a trust, and appeared to have some premonition of his useful and noble career. March 24, 1852; he wrote in his diary: "In these leaves my every day life is entered; the past is already recorded and stands forth in bold letters, saying, 'Improve!' Cast off those things in your conduct which mar the beauty of your life, and treasure up where they will not corrupt the good things in your character (for I thank Heaven that I feel as though I am not wholly given up to evil). Ah! what are these pages to tell? The future. The dark future which no human eye can pierce, and which like the Sibylline Books are blank to mortal eyes. Their surface is now free from a stain, and as I truly record my daily actions, God grant that when I look over its pages I can say, 'I rejoice for in them I can find no evil.' What can there be more precious to me than these volumes which treasure up passing thoughts—thoughts of youth and as I hope of manhood for the future. One more incentive for good—these leaves, though now known to the Supreme God, are a nonentity to man; but still the changes of time may pass them into some scrutinizing fellow-mortal's hand.* If ever such should be the case, how degrading would be my life, if a life of sin." Such sentiments from a youth of twenty, surrounded by the temptations of college life, savor almost of inspiration and Divinity.

Even at this time in his life, Nelson never took a serious step without careful thought and consideration. Hitherto he had entertained no particular feeling on the matter of religion; and in April of that year, during a revival at Waterville, he entered in his diary quite a lengthy dissertation on religion and salvation. He argued the points pro and con as if he were going through a sort of self-examination. He wrote among other things: "It is certainly right that we should honor God for the bounties He is daily showering upon us. I certainly feel that He has been merciful to me; and that I have not shown Him that gratitude I should for it. I feel that for some good purpose, He has thus far preserved my life; that on one occasion especially He raised me (as it were) from the grave, and I cannot ponder over His character without a feel-

ing of adoration for Him who guides the Universe. That there is a great first cause—a divinity—who guides all nature, cannot be doubted. * * * * We have then to acknowledge a God who rules all things; a future world, and that some of us at least are to be its inhabitants. The precise shape we are to be in, matters very little, for it is evident that we are to be in a state approximating to our present. * * * * I have faith in religion, but want the feeling to enter upon it. Here I stand, and unless some supernatural power shall move my feelings I do not know as I shall feel that I have been regenerated."

Thus wrote this young theologian, who was seeing the first dawn of a christian faith. The supernatural power did move his feelings, and he experienced a change of heart and was blessed by the Holy Spirit. On the second of May, 1852, he wrote that "the step I have taken is an important one—important as regards this world, and as to a future world, of incalculable value. I have voluntarily taken upon myself a course which I feel that without the aid of God I cannot maintain. I can only pray that God will give me grace and strength to be a shining light." And He did!

The key to Nelson's life was love and affection—not of the light and shallow kind but that which springs from a tender heart and a noble soul. He formed attachments during these college days that brought out the tenderest and sweetest sentiments that can spring from the human heart. But reason always governed. Of an attachment to a young lady friend, he wrote: "I think of nothing more than friendship now, for I am engaged in a course which demands my whole attention, yet my mind—my heart—delights at times to rise from the monotony of books, and seek the society of her who is a friend to me." And while in a sentimental reverie, he wrote a long dissertation on "What is Love"—full of sound logic and tender words.

The remainder of that college year was spent in deep study, moonlight walks with one "whose company was dear," debates in the college society and visits to his old home in Unity. In August he was a sophomore; and of the commencement exercises at Waterville that summer, he wrote interesting and glowing accounts in his diary.

As an evidence of the practical interest he took in politics, it is interesting to note that in the spring of this year he "bet a hat worth \$4.00 with C. H. Davis that Crosby would be the next governor of the state." This is the only record of any bet that he


ever made; and while it is not perhaps quite orthodox, he will doubtless be pardoned because it was made in a good cause.

Nelson was rapidly coming to the front as a local political leader. As proof of this it might be stated that he attended, as a delegate from Unity, the Whig state convention at Portland, June 3, 1852, and wrote of it as "the most enthusiastic meeting the Whigs have had since 1840." William G. Crosby was nominated for governor; and among the delegates chosen to the national convention at Baltimore, was William Pitt Fessenden. Nelson listened with intense interest to speeches by George Evans and Pitt Fessenden. On the night of June 21st he participated in a grand ratification meeting of the Whigs in honor of General Scott's nomination. His father was nominated one of the state senators from Waldo county by the Whigs. There was no election by the people, but he was elected by the legislature when it assembled in January 1853. The legislature also elected William G. Crosby (Whig), governor, and Nelson won his bet.

This year (1852) the Anti-Maine-Law party was formed, which drew many votes from the Democratic nominee for governor, John Hubbard, and defeated him. As a result of this new party, there was formed the new Maine-Law party to counteract it, having for its candidate in the following year, Anson P. Morrill. With this party Nelson determined to identify himself.

Early in September he returned to Waterville, and began his sophomore year. He continued to take an active part in college debates and literary exercises. October 29, 1852, Daniel Webster died and Nelson wrote of the event as follows: "The dread messenger has suddenly removed from her midst the pillar of the Nation, the leader of the Whig party, the defender of the constitution. * * * * His loss is a Nation's loss and his greatest monument will be in the hearts of his countrymen. The names of those who have usurped a higher place in the Nation may soon perish, but the name of Webster will be adored in the far future. A Nation mourns. From Maine to Texas, the solemn tolling of the bells, the stifled groans of a people ascend to bear their echoes to the Heavens. Let me twine one wreath o'er his fair brow, and shed one tear o'er the turf under which our idol reposes." A more sincere and glowing tribute was never paid to Daniel Webster; for this great statesman, protectionist and expounder of the constitution was the young student's idol.¹

1—Mr. Dingley's estimate of Daniel Webster, whom he admired from early



DARTMOUTH COLLEGE—
HANOVER, NEW HAMPSHIRE.



The election of Franklin Pierce in November was a great disappointment to Nelson. The Whigs in Maine were routed. The young politician accounted for the defeat thus: "Treason in our own ranks has achieved this whole matter. The irritation of the Webster Whigs and the charge of abolitionism against Scott has done what the enemy alone could not do." But the disappointment in Maine over the election of Pierce was mitigated somewhat by the election in the following January of William Pitt Fessenden for U. S. Senator. Nelson's father was in the state senate and voted for Fessenden; and he said in later years that it was one of the proudest acts of his life.

February 15, 1853, Nelson reached his majority, and of this important event he wrote: "I, indeed, am a citizen of the United States. Yet freedom in this thing has no pleasure for me. I never looked forward to it with interest. I am legally afloat on the world of waters—the future is unknown. Whatever talents I may have, I am called upon to use for the benefit of my fellow-men. God grant that my voice may be one of usefulness."

Early in May of that year (1853) Nelson had some misunderstanding with the college faculty, particularly President David Sheldon. The young man thought he was unjustly accused of misconduct, and without further delay applied to the faculty for a letter of dismissal. The request was granted, and on the 4th of May he severed all connections with Waterville College. It is gratifying to know that from the correspondence between Nelson and his father, all of which has been preserved, the father upheld his son. The probability is that the unfortunate affair between the trustees and the student, was wholly the result of a misunderstanding.

He had already been in correspondence with friends at Dartmouth College, and on Monday morning, May 23d, he started in the stage for Hanover, N. H. On that day he wrote that "this is the first time I have ever left my native state to remain for any length of time, and naturally my parents as well as myself feel great

manhood, is shown in an article he wrote on the centennial of the birthday of the great statesman, in 1883: "As a constitutional lawyer, as an advocate, as a publicist, as an occasional orator, Webster has never had a peer in the New World. There have been lawyers more learned, publicists of broader historical acquirements, orators like Prentiss, more fertile in imagination, or like Choate, more impassioned and fervid. But Webster's pre-eminence lies in his clear grasp of affairs. His understanding was phenomenal. His rare mental powers prepared him for authoritative annunciation of American ideas, while his unrivaled gifts as an orator, qualified him to impress himself upon his time by that almost irresistible power of clear argument, impressive rhetoric, noble voice and commanding presence. If our youth are to take lessons in forensic skill, to study periods of history or of rhetoric, to know their country and its spirit, they cannot neglect the life and works of Daniel Webster."

solicitude for my success. I leave with high hopes for the future—but God only knows whether they will be realized."

He parted from friends at Waterville who gave genuine evidence that his character was valued by them. He wrote: "I leave behind me in Waterville many a long and prized friend, whose memory will ever be dear to me."

He reached Hanover at five o'clock on the morning of May 24th, 1853. He was twenty-one years old, and alone in a strange community. If he had been inclined to touches of the blues, they would have made their appearance on this occasion. But he kept up good spirits; and on that dismal day in his room at the hotel, he wrote that "this day without a room, has been one of superlative dullness."

The latter part of May he began his studies at Dartmouth College as a member of the sophomore class. The term passed pleasantly and successfully, and commencement was an event impressed upon his mind from the fact that the great orator, Rufus Choate, pronounced an eulogy on Daniel Webster. Nelson wrote that "Choate is probably the greatest orator in the Union. It could not have been improved."

The college term over, Nelson returned to Unity, by way of Waterville. At the latter place his old friends met him and together they indulged in an old-fashioned good time. The latter part of August he was elected a Whig delegate to the county convention at Belfast, where he helped renominate his father for state senator. A good share of his vacation was also spent in the city of Auburn, where his father had invested in a stock of goods. In addition to this he found time to contribute several articles to the Belfast Signal.

The first term of his Junior year at Dartmouth began early in September, and Nelson was promptly at his desk. His time was profitably spent and he was studious and prominent in his class. He, together with brothers from Waterville, established a Zeta Psi chapter at Dartmouth which was influential ever after in that college.

The state election in Maine that fall aroused his deep interest. He hoped for large Whig gains; but he was content with recording that "on the whole the result of the election is gratifying." William G. Crosby (Whig) failed of an election by the people, but was elected later by the legislature. Nelson's father was defeated for state senator.

During this term of college he took high rank as a writer and speaker, and on October 27, 1853 made his first public appearance with an original composition on "Property." He closed this remarkable oration with the following language: "In the highest sense property lies in the realm of eternity. The stores which man by a life of toil has laid up to gratify his inclination—the roof which shelters his gray hairs may be consumed in a single night; and the strong man who a few hours since boasted of the magnitude of his possessions will have no place to lay his head. The smouldering ashes alone remain to tell the tale. The intellectual giant who to-day charms the world by his varied talents—by his kindling eloquence—tomorrow may be a tenant of the silent tomb. It is sad to see the agony of the man of the world—whose whole life has been spent in amassing wealth, and who now, that whitened locks warn him of the approach of old age, thinks to withdraw to some peaceful spot and there reap the fruits of the seed sown when youth and bright hopes were his, who, having scarcely commenced that blissful life which he vainly imagined earth had in store for him, is called to leave behind his earthly idol and enter upon another life where neither gold nor scrip can avail him. But how is our sadness turned into joy, if that man while he has amassed treasures for his earthly body has laid up in eternity property to which death but unites him, and who, when the wrinkled face and stooping form tell him that the measure of his life is full, can bid adieu to earth and mount to Heaven—there with reinvigorated faculties to enjoy his eternal property."

His nature was poetic, tender and loving. He was filled with ambition, and frequently in the quiet of his study, permitted his fertile and imaginative mind to wander as it were on the pages of his diary. One November evening he wrote:

"Time has passed away, but fond memory has treasured up its pleasures—its trials. As I sit by my table—solitary—I see one by one the days of my youth pass in reverie before me. I see the loved playmates of my early days—the old school house where we daily congregated. Even now I see the sports which then delighted us—the games so dear to childhood. I call to mind one with whom my heart was locked—but Ah! where is he? The village churchyard, the mound where the woodbine winds—the white headstone—point out where all that is earthly of him rests. His spirit has gone to that bright land where its purity can alone find a resting

place. I call to mind many others who shared in my youthful sports—some have wandered to distant lands—some have cast off the robes of childhood, and put on the helmet of maturity. Some whom I knew as girls in the simplicity of childhood have left the roof where a mother's love had surrounded them and trusted their loving hearts to strangers—Oh what charges to lead to that bright world beyond the tomb! I see the retreats of my youth—surrounded with all the charms which memory can picture. I see my early trials. I call to mind the fancied injuries which ardent youth treasures up. I see myself hastening home to be consoled by that ever healing balm—a mother's love. Once more I look and this early dream has vanished. I see the stage coach standing before the door which is to bear me away from the roof which has protected my weakness. I see new associates—new faces. The dream of my childhood has passed, and college walls disclose new scenes. I see my many trials—my many pleasures. I see the friends who have supplied my youthful playmates. I call to mind the sorrow which pervaded my heart as one by one I bade them adieu and sought out another college in another state. I call to mind the sense of loneliness which my location created—the longing for those left behind. Once again I see new associates—new joys—new trials. Far away I see the fire-side at home—that happy spot to which my heart would fain fly. I see those who loved me—those whom I loved. Once again I look into the future, but at times how dreamy—at times how cheerful. Now I see myself perched on the highest round of the ladder of fame—now an out-cast—none so poor to do me reverence. Hope—the day spring of life—beckons me on—to burn the midnight oil—to prepare to launch my boat upon the ocean of life.”

November 30, 1854, found Nelson in Unity, at the bedside of his dear friend, Mr. Hiram Whitehouse. Death came and of the sorrow that overwhelmed the widow Nelson wrote: “The companion of her heart, the pillar around which clustered her affections, the casket which held her youthful love has been snatched away by the rugged hands of death. ‘So be ye also ready.’”

About the middle of December 1853, he commenced teaching school in the Parkhurst district having about fifty scholars. To the school committee of that district he presented the following recommendation from the President of Dartmouth College:

The beaver, Mr. Nelson Dringley Jr
is a young gentleman of superior
scholarship and unblemished morals.
He is, in my judgment, well
qualified for the duties of a teacher
of youth.

Carvin D. Stanton.

D. College, }

Nov. 1053. }

Y
S

Impressed with the importance of more frequent practice in extemporaneous debate, we hereby form ourselves into an organization for the acquirement of facility in speaking, after the plan of the U. S. Senate, each state being represented by one or more members. This body to meet at such time & place as may hereafter be determined.

EX
ARY

"The bearer, Mr. Nelson Dingley Jr., is a young gentleman of superior scholarship and unblemished morals. He is in my judgment, well qualified for the duties of a teacher of youth."

Edwin D. Sanborn.

Nov. 1853.

That winter his father and mother moved to Auburn, and Nelson assisted them in packing their household goods. About the middle of February he closed his school for the winter, bade adieu to Unity, and left for his new home in Auburn. Thus the home of his childhood became a thing of the past. Here Nelson had resided fifteen years; here he spent his childhood days; here his character was formed. The plain one and a half story house where he lived with his parents so long, every room of which was hallowed by sweet memories, was leased and later sold to the Methodist parish of that village.

Friday, March 3, 1854, found him again pursuing his studies at Dartmouth. His room-mate was S. R. Bond of Ipswich, Mass., subsequently a resident of Washington, and a staunch friend during Nelson's public career. This term, he made his first appearance in public debate before the United Fraternity, on the affirmative side of the question: "Is it expedient to preserve the so-called balance of power in Europe." He spent his spring vacation helping his father in his store at Auburn, and about the middle of May returned to college.

It appears that there had been little class spirit and class organization at Dartmouth in previous years, and Nelson sought to cultivate this by organizing his class after the manner of the United States Senate. He therefore drew up the following paper: "Impressed with the importance of more frequent practice in ex-tempore debates, we hereby form ourselves into an organization for the acquirement of facility in speaking, after the plan of the U. S. Senate, each state being represented by one or more members—this body to meet at such time and place as may hereafter be determined." This paper was signed by Nelson and thirty-four of his classmates. It is needless to say that great benefit was derived by all the members of the class who participated in this college senate; and we can easily understand that Nelson took a leading part and added to that facility of speech and quickness of thought which marked his entire public life.

He was a constant and fluent writer, contributing articles to different papers. About the middle of June he sent his first con-

tribution to the Lewiston Journal. The subject of this article was "The Caucasus." Little did he suspect that his future would be intimately associated with that paper! He first saw a copy of the Lewiston Journal in the spring of that year (1854). It was then a small village weekly of perhaps seven hundred circulation. He was attracted to it by the fact that Rev. James Drummond, the Congregational minister in Auburn, was contributing to it, and this fact led to his introduction to both Mr. Drummond and Col. Waldron, the latter the editor and proprietor of the Journal. His first contribution was accepted and doubtless its appearance was very gratifying to the author.

It was during this summer vacation that he did his first real newspaper work. He reported for the Lewiston Journal the proceedings of the Supreme Judicial Court of Androscoggin county, and a political mass meeting in favor of Hon. J. J. Perry for congress. Nelson's reports, found in the early files of the Lewiston Journal, were in the same clear and easy style that characterized his later newspaper work. This so pleased William Waldron, the owner and editor of the Journal, that later (September 20th) he engaged Nelson to write a column or two each week for the Journal at \$100 per year. He wrote for the Journal, taught school at Sabbatusville, and studied politics. He also cast his first vote this fall for Anson P. Morrill the anti-slavery and temperance candidate for governor.

About 1848 the Free Soil party was formed having a principle that gave it a national and popular character. It attained to considerable magnitude in the middle states, and the Abolition party became merged in this, George F. Talbot being its first candidate for governor in Maine, in 1849. It threw a variable number of votes until 1854, when they were divided between Isaac Reed the Whig nominee and Anson P. Morrill, the candidate of the Maine Law and Know-Nothing parties, giving the latter the largest number of votes but not a majority; and his election came from the state legislature.

Nelson was still an omnivorous reader, and his diary is full of the names of standard books which he read at that time. He had a way of jotting down a synopsis of every book he read and commenting on the style and the moral. His estimate of the plays of Shakespeare and of the works of Hawthorne, Ike Marvel, DeQuincy, Longfellow, Willis, Cooper, Dickens and Scott, as well as Poe, are exceedingly interesting. In October he delivered his first

lecture before the scholars of his school and the citizens of Sabat-tusville. His theme was "The student life of Daniel Webster." ¹ The original manuscript of this lecture, in a clear cut and business-like hand, is among the much prized papers he left. The lecture was both able and interesting, for it was his estimate of his idol. The middle of November 1854, he commenced active work on the Lewiston Journal at \$22.50 per month. He took entire charge of the editorial columns, directed the paper to the list of subscribers, (about 800), and spent the remainder of his time setting type. And as if this was not enough to consume his entire time he even wrote the "Journal Carrier Boys New Year Address"—a piece of poetry of more or less merit and great originality.

He experienced the trials of a country editor the first month he was in the harness. Prof. Champlin of Waterville College lectured in Auburn, and the new editor of the Journal in commenting on the lecture, indulged in some mild criticism. The next number of the Advocate, the organ of the Baptists, edited by Dr. Dyer, contained a severe article attacking the young student-editor personally, and declaring that the latter had a private grudge against Prof. Champlin. The next week Nelson published a vigorous article defending his criticism, and followed it up with another. There was great excitement among the leading Baptists, but the Journal editor stood his ground. While the incident doubtless appeared to be of great gravity at that time, passing years have softened whatever asperity may have cropped out and made the incident more amusing than serious; but it afforded evidence of Nelson's vigorous style and gave promise of his singularly successful newspaper career.

On the first day of January 1855, he recorded in his diary that "the members elect of the legislature are assembling, and it is settled that those chosen as Whigs, Morrill Democrats and Free Soilers will unite and form a new party, to be called the Republican party. This party will live." Prophetic words!

The middle of February he closed his winter's work in the Lewiston Journal office and returned to Dartmouth College. His closing term was profitable, and he had proved a faithful student and was assigned one of the commencement parts and given the subject: "The Intellectual Progress of Humanity." ¹ This commencement oration although brief was thoughtful and philosophic. Although not an orator his earnestness of manner and his pleasing address marked him as one of the most promising members of his class.

1—See Appendix.

His last recitation took place the middle of July and he wrote in his diary: "I can conscientiously say that my time has been, for the most part properly improved, and that I repent not in the least of the money and labor expended in drinking from the fountains of liberal knowledge. I leave college with high hopes for the future. What may be my position, God only knows. May I be prepared for whatever He has in store for me."

Wendell Phillips delivered the commencement oration, and Nelson with sixteen others was admitted to the Phi Beta Kappa society. Nelson was sixth in a class of 51, the order being as follows—Field, Allen, Tenney, Clark, Scales, Dingley, Taylor, Pike, etc. The valedictorian of the class was Walbridge A. Field,¹ afterwards Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts. Thus closed Nelson's college career. He was, as he wrote, "what the world called a liberally educated young man."

1—Chief Justice Field, in 1839, soon after Nelson's death and only three months before his own death, thus wrote of his distinguished classmate: "Mr. Dingley was not one of those students who will tip back their chairs and let their minds roam over the whole creation. He was deeply interested in a few things, and made himself their master. While he was at college he was especially fond of studying forms of government. I remember that before Mr. Dingley came to college, our class was not in the habit of meeting often. It was he who called the class together, and it was he that made the opening resolutions, neatly and effectively arrayed in first, second, third, etc. He got us to form ourselves into a senate of the United States. There were fifty-one of us, and he set us to practicing the form of procedure of our national upper house. This senate we maintained for some time. He was an honest man. Everyone respected his thorough integrity. He was always modest and retiring. As a scholar he was not brilliant, but he was thorough. In everything he was thorough."

S. R. Bond of Washington, D. C., Nelson's room-mate at Dartmouth college, writes as follows: "Nelson Dingley Jr. entered our class of 1856 in its sophomore year, and an intimacy soon sprang up between us which led to our becoming room-mates. It did not take long for him to impress us with the fact that he had come to study and learn, and to make the most of his time and talents. He was thoughtful and studious in his habits, prompt and constant at recitations and other class exercises; but these were far from constituting the whole of his study and means of mental discipline. His reading outside the college curriculum was extensive, but discriminating, and more didactic in its character than is generally selected by youths of his age. Our class organized what we ambitiously called "The Senate," and with Cushing's and Jefferson's Manuals as our guides, endeavored to conduct it after the manner of the august body for which it was named. I was its president, and distinctly remember that Mr. Dingley was chairman of the two committees on finance and foreign relations, and was so earnest and industrious in discharging the duties of those positions that he prepared and presented reports upon the matters referred to his committees, with a care and seriousness which would have become a veritable legislative body. He was notably fond of the study of parliamentary rules and practice, and became as high an authority on those subjects among us as he was held in after life among the members of the legislative bodies in which he so ably served his state and country. Towards the end of our college course it was a favorite pastime of some of us to speculate as to the probable pursuits and careers of our class-mates, and I did not fail to recognize in him that bent of mind and study that would help to make him an ideal legislator. One of the text books of our course was Say's Political Economy, in which free trade is strenuously advocated, yet neither of us assented to it as an authority to control our national policy, but regarded it as the impracticable theory of a doctrinaire. Nathan Lord, D. D., was our college president, and while we admired and revered his great ability, and his intense zeal for the welfare of the students under his charge, yet his out-and-out defense, and even advocacy, of slavery as a

CHAPTER IV.

1855-1860.

Nelson was now twenty-three years of age. He was educated far beyond his years and time, and had so improved his moments that he was remarkably well-equipped for a long and useful career. He possessed an active and fertile brain, a retentive memory, tireless energy, and an indomitable will. He was bold and yet cautious, brave and yet discreet. Filled with ambition he set sail manfully on the voyage of life.

At once he began to write for the Lewiston Journal, and at the same time began the study of law in the office of Morrill and Fessenden in Danville, now Auburn, then a pretty and thriving village of about three thousand, and the county-seat. The railroad reached Auburn in 1848, and the village grew rapidly. Its future was now assured, and far-seeing people predicted that this would be the site of at least one and perhaps two thriving manufacturing cities. But

divine institution, and the emphasis which he laid upon "Cursed be Canaan," made less impression upon our anti-slavery convictions than did Say's upon our protective proclivities. Mr. Dingley was by no means one of those monstrosities who had no youth. He did not, within proper bounds "go back" on those little enterprises and episodes which were occasionally indulged in by his class, or his intimate associates, and which served to vary the monotony of college life and as harmless outlets for the ebullition of youthful spirits, yet his general conduct was marked by a sedateness of thought and demeanor somewhat beyond the average of his class-mates. I can bear witness to the strong, abiding love which he always cherished for his alma mater, and for those ties of friendship which were formed in his college days. He seldom failed to attend the annual reunion of the Dartmouth Alumni Association at Washington, D. C., and often spoke feelingly and impressively of the old college, its faithful and earnest instructors, and the members of our class who were one by one passing over to the great majority. At the reunion of our class at Hanover in 1896, on the occasion of its fortieth anniversary, he and Chief Justice Field of Massachusetts, whose recent death has called forth such general regret and eulogy, were among the less than a dozen of us who were present, and no one evinced a keener interest than

the fire of 1855 destroyed \$75,000 worth of property and cast a gloom over the whole place. In this fire Nelson's father lost his entire stock of goods, only about one-half insured.

The law office of Morrill & Fessenden was the center of politics. Nahum Morrill (subsequently Judge Morrill) was a Democrat and T. A. D. Fessenden was a Republican. The former was appointed judge of probate by Gov. Crosby in 1854, and held the office of provost marshal of the second district of Maine throughout the civil war. The latter was a son of General Sam Fessenden of Portland, and was then a Whig and later a Republican. He formed a partnership with Mr. Morrill in 1850, and eight years later was a law partner of William P. Frye, afterwards United States Senator. Mr. Fessenden was a delegate to the national convention that nominated Fremont in 1856, and Grant in 1868; was

did he in recounting reminiscences of our college days, or was more deeply affected by the reading of our class necrology, and the tender words that were spoken of those

"Who had crossed life's seething tide,

And learned what there is on the other side."

"As he loved and honored his college so it did not and could not without signal neglect and ingratitude, fail to recognize his worth and well-earned eminence by conferring upon him the degree of LL. D., which every living son of Dartmouth must acknowledge as most worthily bestowed."

A. J. Pike of Minnesota, another class-mate of Mr. Dingley's, writes that when in college Mr. Dingley was an ardent protectionist, and once became very anxious over the free trade teachings of the professor. The text book that was used was Say's Political Economy. As the class proceeded with the study of the work it seemed to be leading directly to the approval of free trade as opposed to protection. Mr. Dingley consulted with the professor in private and gave him some reasons why the condition of our government was exceptional, to which free trade could not apply. The matter was brought up in the class and Mr. Dingley was sustained in his position, and from that time until the end of the term the protectionist's side of the question was given a chance and the arguments laid down in the text book suffered materially.

Greenleaf Clark of St. Paul, Minn., another class-mate of Mr. Dingley's, writes: "He was a well-regulated, self-contained, diligent student who had himself well in hand. He gave it out that journalism was his chosen vocation, and that political affairs were to his taste and interested him. He was always active and a leader in college and class politics. I think it may be said of him, what does not always follow, that his subsequent life developed upon the precise lines indicated when he was in college."

Mr. Silas Hardy, a member of the class of 1855, thus writes of his class-mate: "I had the pleasure of being a class-mate with Mr. Dingley in old Dartmouth, class of 1855, both graduating together. I remember his looks on that occasion. He came from Waterville (Maine) college in May of our sophomore year. He introduced and established a chapter of the Zeta Psi secret society at Dartmouth. I joined the society and thereby was brought into close relation with him. He was a modest, unassuming young man, intelligent, and of excellent character, studious, but did not rank high as a recitation scholar—about medium—but was quite a reader. He had a happy faculty of speaking in public, and in a very pointed and sensible way. He was a clean young man and stood well as a fellow. I feel it an honor to have associated with him."

In Nelson's Dartmouth College class book, dated 1855, he wrote these words beneath the picture of his chum:

"Chum, never forget the many pleasing associations which hang around No. 13, Thornton Hall.

"How pleasantly sweet are the echoes that start,

"When memory plays an old tune on the heart.

"Nelson Dingley Jr.

"Natus 1832."

a state representative, county attorney, and member of congress. Like all his family, he was a brilliant man and a splendid lawyer. Mr. Morrill was also a fine lawyer and a hard-headed business man.

Nelson had at this time about fully made up his mind to be a lawyer. September 17, 1855, he wrote in his diary: "I have decided to make law my profession. I intend to fit myself well for so honorable a duty; and I trust that with God's help, I may do some little good in this world, if my life and health shall be spared." At the October term of the probate court for Androscoggin county he served as register pro tem in the absence of the register. All that autumn he was deep in the mysteries of Blackstone, Kent, Chitty and other legal lights.

Throughout this entire period (from January to September 1855) he was practically the editor of the *Lewiston Journal*.¹ He was vigorous in style and independent in thought. January 20th he wrote a leading article for the *Journal* entitled "Parties and Principles." "There have been at least two presidential campaigns" he wrote, "wherein the contest has been only for spoils—where the many have madly rushed on after their leaders, while they have coolly pocketed the spoils. We were delighted at the victory which our party had gained, but have never realized the golden promises which they have held out to us. * * * Even now, though our reason assures us that the party with which we have always sympathized should be dissolved, yet the very mention of the name which distinguished it will call to mind former days when it was our delight to labor for its success; and memories of its past history and the long list of honored men whose names are as familiar as household words, who battle for its principles, but who are now gathered to their fathers, will flit before our minds as if to impel us to still cling even to an empty name. * * * The caucus machinery of political parties, as it is now arranged, almost entirely leaves the management of its affairs to office-seekers themselves. * * * The time has been and perhaps in some states may be now, when any man, no matter how manifestly unqualified he might be for the office, provided he received the nomination, could be elected. When parties arrive at such a point they should be dissolved, for the name predominates over the principles. * * A consideration of these facts has led to the present disruption of parties, and the formation of a new party composed of those who

¹—The *Belfast Age* said in September, 1855: "Aside from the *Journal's* abominable politics, we must say that its editorials are ably and candidly written. Nelson Dingley Jr., the editor, is a scholar, a gentleman, and a young man of fine talent. He will make one of the ablest editors in New England."

think that the aggression of the slave power calls for resistance on the part of the north. This party also embodies the principles which dictate the passage of laws for the improvement of society—such as laws against the vending of intoxicating liquors, laws organizing associations to perform objects of general utility too extensive for individual enterprise. This party believes that government should not stop when it has protected man in his rights, but should aid him by judicious expenditures of public money in improving the means of communication between the different parts of our union. The *laissez faire* doctrine, which would leave every man to sit under his own fig tree, careless and indifferent to what was going on around him, is not the theory, which, when practiced, will make a government subserve the interests of society. We rejoice that the days when names and jealousies dictated the policy of our country are fast passing away; and that a brighter era whose influence we already have gently felt, is nearly at hand."

The Whig party was rapidly disintegrating. It had fallen into the hands of spoilsmen and self-seeking politicians. In 1832 it made a great mistake in not warmly supporting Jackson on the state rights and nullification issue, which Calhoun and South Carolina had raised. It was the first time that the pestilent idea of state rights as against national supremacy had been squarely put before the people; and Jackson took so decided ground in favor of national supremacy in the contest with South Carolina in 1833, that the Whigs ought to have come over to his support, and buried forever the state rights idea, invented to protect slavery, which was the bane of the country, which caused the rebellion and which threatened to deprive the nation of the fruits of the great war. In 1833 there was every indication that the Whigs would rally to the support of Jackson against whom Calhoun was waging relentless war. Webster was Jackson's leading supporter. But soon after bitter feelings arose—over the removal of the deposits from the national bank—a matter of no importance, and the Whig party lost their favorable opportunity, and left Calhoun to win over the south, nearly solid, to the support of his state rights ideas.

Popular feeling against Van Buren's financial policy in 1836, and the growth of the feeling against the Democratic party controlled by the south, was made evident in the Maine election of 1837 when Kent was elected governor. In 1838 and 1839 the Democrats rallied and elected Fairfield governor. In 1840 there was a most remarkable campaign. Torchlight processions and other political clap-trap first made their appearance. The

Whigs of Maine elected Kent governor by 50 majority, and from that moment "have you heard the news from Maine" became the Whig song and rallying cry.

The Liberty or Abolition party first appeared in Maine in 1841 when Jeremiah Curtis was elected governor. In 1844 the Abolitionists supported James G. Birney for president. Mr. Clay's friends were displeased. The Abolitionists might have elected Clay, for Polk received only 170 votes with the 36 of New York. The Abolitionists replied that they preferred Clay, but both parties said they were bidding for southern support. When the Whigs should take square ground against slavery, the Abolitionists said they would abandon their organization. Both parties fought shy of anti-slavery. In 1848 the northern Whigs defeated in congress a slavery resolution desired by the southern Whigs, which undoubtedly contributed to the election of Taylor, who received 163 electoral votes to 127 for Cass. Van Buren, who ran as a Free Soil candidate, also contributed to Taylor's election and Cass' defeat. The death of Taylor and the succession of Fillmore, who proved subservient to the wishes of the south, prepared the way for the fall of the Whig party, and the reorganization of parties on new issues.

From 1850 to 1858 was the darkest period in the history of the country. The passage of the so-called compromise measure of 1850—the enactment of the fugitive slave law—(the foulest blot on the statutes of this country)—the bending of the knee to the slave power by Webster, Clay, Douglas, Pierce, and the leading Democratic and Whig politicians—the defeat of Scott in 1852 and the election of Pierce because the latter had promised the south the most—all contributed to cast a gloom over the anti-slavery men. Even in Maine the Free Soil vote diminished and the Democratic vote increased.

The leaders of the anti-slavery and temperance movement in Maine were now firmly convinced that nothing could be accomplished through the old Whig party, and the sentiments expressed in the vigorous editorial written by Nelson, and quoted above, reflected the opinions of a large majority of the earnest and active political leaders of the state. As an outcome of this political situation a new party was formed in the winter of 1854-5. Anson P. Morrill was its candidate for governor, and Nelson in the columns of the *Lewiston Journal* vigorously defended him. He was opposed by Samuel Wells. The prohibitory law was the main issue, and while Morrill had a plurality of the popular vote, the legislature

elected Wells. Under the caption "A Word to Whigs," Nelson wrote: "The Whig party of the north have claimed to be opposed to the extension of slavery. Doubtless nearly every member of that party still honestly cherishes such views. Now the question comes up, where will the honest Whig find a body of men who believe the same as he does on the question of slavery? We answer that such a party has spontaneously risen up and has taken the name of Republican. No other party which has strength, stands outspoken in favor of freedom. It is not a party which has been called together by leaders—it has arisen in spite of leaders. It is the embodiment of northern sentiment; and in every state, it is rapidly assuming a commanding position."

The failure of the Republicans of Maine to elect Morrill governor, did not dishearten them. Nelson wrote that "the prospects of the Republican party though suffering under a temporary defeat look far from dark. One year hence, and we will retrieve this defeat by such a majority as will proclaim the continued adherence of Maine to free principles."

Of the approaching crisis over the slavery agitation and the teachings of Douglas and his followers, he wrote: "Shall we refuse to mete out to Douglas, Pierce & Co. the punishment which they so rightly merit, or shall we have no opinion to express respecting their base treachery? * * * Let us remember that in union there is strength, and let us not forget that in no way can that union which we so highly prize be shattered by a persistence in well doing, and by a steady and uniform resistance to the plots which seek to make its government hostile to the spirit of liberty."

Again he wrote: "The great battle is soon to be fought, which is to determine whether liberty and self-government can walk hand in hand. While the privileged class are drawing to their support the name of the Democratic party, while Hunker Whigs are joining this aristocratic organization, let the friends of liberty, forgetting all past differences, buckle on the armor of freedom. The Union, with all its liberties which it has made to preserve, may yet be preserved if we will be true to our hearts and bid adieu to political leaders forever. Now is the time. Soon there will be no opportunity to retrieve our losses, and to roll back the tide of slavery and tyranny. If we shall but stand shoulder to shoulder, and meet the crisis with a will resolved to conquer, history at least, will record with patriotic exultation that the intelligence and virtue of the people saved their country when it was on the edge of the Tarpeian Rock; but if we falter and follow the deceitful music of political

sirens, while our liberties are destroyed, the historian will dwell with sorrow over the blindness and passion which sink a great nation into the depths of weakness and despotism."

On the assembling of the first session of the 34th congress he made this comment: "From this session of congress we have much to hope and much to fear; and the manner in which our national representatives shall execute the responsible trusts imposed upon them will determine in a great measure the mission of this Republic." Maine was represented in the U. S. senate by Hannibal Hamlin and William Pitt Fessenden; and in the house by John M. Wood, John J. Perry, Ebenezer Knowlton, Samuel P. Benson, Israel Washburn, Jr., and Thomas J. B. Fuller.

On the night of December 30, 1855, a fire destroyed the block in which the office of Morrill & Fessenden was located; and Nelson recorded in his diary as the only real important incident of this catastrophe: "My books were saved, but my dressing gown was lost."

The winter and spring were spent by him in the study of the law and in writing for the Lewiston Journal. He also figured as toast-master at a teacher's institute in Auburn. He made a hit; and at the annual town meeting in the spring was elected a member of the local school committee—the first office he ever held.

The state legislature met early in January, 1856, and Samuel Wells was elected governor. His election was accomplished by a combination of the Democrats and a few Whigs, the latter caring more for office than for principle. Nelson commented on this event as follows, under the title of "Last Days of the Whig Party in Maine:"

"With a look such as Caesar gave Brutus in the senate chamber at Rome, the dying victim covered its head, and as the spirit took its flight and a voice was heard declaring 'Samuel Wells elected governor of Maine', the lips of the death-like face moved and above the din of rejoicing factions, were heard these words:

'Oh! that imperial whiggery, dead and turned to clay
Should stop a hole to keep the truth away.'"

The last of March he was appointed by the state committee a member of the second congressional district Republican committee. The district was then composed of Oxford and Cumberland counties. (What is now Androscoggin county was then a part of Cumberland county.) Sidney Perham, subsequently a member of congress and governor of Maine, was also a member of this committee.

The session of the legislature was a disappointment to the Republicans and for that matter all the good people of the state. Nelson wrote: "In whatever way we may look upon the hundred day rule of the legislature of 1856, nothing but broken promises and unprecedented acts appear. The fact that any person is numbered in the ranks of the coalition majority in that body, will be enough to blast his political reputation. And the reign of Samuel I will ever be regarded as a period fraught with dangerous examples of executive and legislative usurpations." The removal of Hon. Woodbury Davis, one of the judges of the supreme judicial court, by Gov. Wells¹ aroused the hostility and suspicion of not only the Republicans but the good men of all parties.

Nelson was an active member of the Congregational church. He was a practical christian and believed that the best way to serve the Lord was to take active part in the Lord's work and assist materially in building up His societies. His pastor was Rev. James Drummond; and he was accustomed to attend all the church socials not only to widen his acquaintance but to make more close his communion with God's people. It was at one of these socials that he became interested in a young woman of culture and rare attractions—Miss Salome McKenney, daughter of Henry McKenney of Auburn. His interest soon ripened into love; and about the middle of April he recorded in his diary: "To love and to know that love is returned! How many times have I thought of that, always to me, future event! How many times I have longed for the appearance of that person who could satisfy the intense longing of my loving soul."

His love and devotion for the woman of his choice was undying, yea, sublime. The passages in his diary, expressive of his affection for his ideal, are ardent and tender—indicative of a pure and noble soul. "God grant," he wrote, "that I may have strength to love her as I ought—to cherish and protect her through life."

On the 6th of May he acted as secretary of the second district Republican convention to choose delegates to the national convention. Sidney Perham, afterwards governor of Maine, and T. A. D. Fessenden of the firm of Morrill & Fessenden, were two of the delegates elected. The people of Auburn assembled in Jones' hall, May 31, to express their condemnation of Kansan outrages, and the

1.—Judge Woodbury Davis would not at the behest of the Wells administration, render a decision in favor of a pro-slavery candidate for sheriff. This was one of the issues of the campaign and it cost Mr. Wells many votes. Governor Hamlin, who restored Judge Davis to the bench, pronounced the removal an unconstitutional act—at least an error of judgment.

cowardly assault on Senator Sumner. Nelson framed and reported the resolutions that were adopted at that meeting. They were couched in vigorous and terse language and were adopted with enthusiasm. The author of the resolutions also made a short speech and created a splendid impression. It was his first effort at a public political gathering.

Nelson had his first law case early in June of that year (1856). Joshua Small Jr., of Danville, petitioned for an increase of damages in a road condemnation case. Nelson was sent for to appear for Mr. Small. Chas. Goddard appeared for the county. Richard Dresser, Job Prince and Thomas Lane were the committee. The two young attorneys submitted the case in briefs, without argument. The report of the referees was sealed and not opened until the following October. By that time Nelson was launched on a journalistic career, and the verdict of the referees became of little moment to him. At all events, it is not known whether he won or lost. However this may be, it was his first and only law case, and it matters not what the verdict was.

June 11, 1856, Nelson went to Augusta where the supreme judicial court of the middle district of Maine was in session, and on motion of John H. Webster, Esq., of Norridgewock, was admitted to practice in the courts of Maine. The Lewiston Journal, owned by William H. Waldron, said that "Mr. Dingley is a young gentleman of acknowledged talents as many of the articles which he has furnished for our columns give ample testimony. It is his intention to visit the west during the approaching fall and we take this occasion to commend him to the attention of our brethren of the typographical fraternity wherever he may make them a call."

Nelson was armed with the following letter to Lot M. Morrill when he went to Augusta:

Lewiston Falls, June 10, 1856.

Hon. L. M. Morrill,

Dear Sir:—

Allow me to introduce to you the bearer of this letter, Nelson Dingley Jr., Esq., of Danville. Mr. Dingley has been a student at law in our office for some months past, and being about to visit the western states, desired to be admitted to practice law; as attorney and counselor in the courts in this state. I think he is qualified to commence the practice of law, having diligently pursued his studies, and as a gentleman maintained a high character for honor and integrity in his intercourse with his fellow men.

I am aware that it is not customary to admit members to the bar at the law term, but the circumstances under which he is placed induces me to ask you to use your influence to procure his admission by the court of Augusta. By so doing you will confer a favor upon him and upon myself.

Very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
N. Morrill.

He also presented the following:

"I, the undersigned, hereby certify that Nelson Dingley Jr., Esq., the bearer of this, graduated at Dartmouth college, July 26, 1855, and commenced the study of law September 1855, in the office of Messrs. Morrill & Fessenden, at Danville, Androscoggin county, and has continued the study of his profession up to the present time.

Danville, June 10, 1856.

C. Record,
Sec. of the Androscoggin Bar.

About this time Nelson was afflicted with what was then known as the western fever. His intended wife's sister had married and gone to Hudson, Wis. Several of his school friends had also gone to that section of the country; and Nelson, together with his father, on the 16th of June, started on a prospecting tour. They journeyed by way of Boston, New York, Buffalo, Toledo, Chicago, and the Mississippi river to Hudson, Wis. From this point Nelson made several trips north and west. On the 8th of July he pre-empted on a quarter section—range 19, township 30, and S. W. quarter of section 29. This was about ten miles northwest of Hudson. Here he with others, constructed rough cabins, and tried to live. The heat was intense, and the mosquitoes thick and ravenous. The first of August he journeyed to St. Paul and Minneapolis. At that time Minneapolis was a village of about 500 people. Remaining in this locality a week, but never dreaming of the two great cities that were in future years to grow up in this locality, he returned to Hudson and made up his mind that the state of Maine was good enough for him. He reached home the middle of July and at once plunged into the state and national campaign that had already opened. The political contest of 1856 was in full blast, and into it Nelson threw himself with all the ardor and enthusiasm of his nature. He addressed several mass meetings and wrote political articles for the Lewiston Journal.

At this period new questions were claiming the attention of citizens, and naturally new parties were formed upon the new issues. The Temperance, the Abolition and the Know Nothing parties each had aims peculiar to itself; that of the Abolitionists or Liberty party being the abolition of slavery in the United States, and that of the Know Nothing or American party, opposition to foreign influence in our public affairs. The Free Soil party, which the Abolitionists joined, had a more practical plan than they; but this also, a little later, became absorbed in the new Republican party. The latter arose in consequence of the efforts of the slave power to gain possession of Kansas, where the resulting "Border Ruffian" outrages were arousing the indignation and exciting the alarm of the most conservative people.

The principles of the new Republican party¹ were found to be consistent with the views of many of all other parties; while its leading principle of opposition to the extension of slavery, rapidly gained for it an immense following. John C. Fremont, the "Pathfinder of the Rocky Mountains" had been nominated as its candidate for president in Philadelphia, June 18, 1856. James Buchanan was nominated by the Democrats.

Hannibal Hamlin, (one of Maine's noblest sons) who was speaker of the Maine house three times, and from 1842 to 1847 a member of congress, was the Republican candidate for governor of Maine. Hamlin made a vigorous canvass and spoke in Auburn on the night of September 3rd. Excitement was at fever heat, and Nelson with voice and pen battled for the principles of the Republican party.

Hannibal Hamlin was triumphantly elected governor of Maine, and in the Journal under the caption "Maine has Spoken—Hamlin Elected Governor by 17,000 Majority—Gain of 24,000," Nelson wrote: "The voice of Maine has been raised against the iniquitous doctrine promulgated in the Cincinnati platform. She has not spoken feebly, but in thunder tones."

The whole country was looking to the state of Maine. In this election was fired the first gun in the great political contest which was to be waged between the Republican and Democratic parties, representing on the one hand the principles of freedom and a strong


¹—The Michigan state convention, held at Jackson, early in June, 1854, was the first representative body to take the name of Republican. The title was suggested in a letter from Horace Greeley to a delegate to that convention. This letter was shown to Senator Howard and several other influential men. The suggestion was deemed a good one, and the name was formally adopted in the resolutions of the convention. A few weeks later it was adopted by a state convention in Maine.

Federal government, and on the other the principles of slavery and states rights. Immense crowds attended every political rally. Salutes were fired, red lights blazed, and bands of music discoursed patriotic airs from one end of the state to the other. It was the most picturesque campaign Maine had had for years, and with a brilliant leader like Hamlin, who surrendered his democracy for his high ideals of human freedom, the Republican party was fired with an extraordinary zeal that almost amounted to frenzy. It is not strange, therefore, that the victory of the Republican party was hailed with delight and intense enthusiasm. It gave confidence to the leaders of the new party in every northern state, and paved the way for the final triumph of Republican principles four years later.


Nelson was a born journalist and could not resist the natural bent of his mind. As a regular contributor to and practical editor of the Lewiston Falls Journal, he created a splendid impression in the community and made the Journal a political power. Finally about the middle of September, 1856, he concluded arrangements for the purchase from W. H. Waldron of a half interest in the "Lewiston Falls Journal" as it was then called, paying therefor \$2,203.24.¹ This included a one-half interest in the "Maine Evangelist," a religious paper formerly published at Rockland, Me. A week later he took editorial charge of the two papers, associating with him Revs. Drummond and Balkam, local Congregational ministers. On the 20th of September the first number of the Lewiston Falls Journal under the management of Waldron and Dingley, appeared. Mr. Waldron published over his signature: "Our new associate is already well known to the most of our citizens as a young man of talent, with some experience in the editorial department of newspaper management. In his new sphere of usefulness as one of the managers of the Journal already enjoying an extensive circulation, his influence will be for good."


On the same day the Journal published this card signed "Nelson Dingley Jr.": "We shall discuss calmly, and with due respect for the opinions of others, national, state and local questions. The general tone of the Journal on all the great political questions of the day will remain unchanged. Without surrendering ourselves to the dictation of any party or clique, we shall give our hearty sup-

1—The Lewiston Journal was started by Alonzo Garcelon May 31, 1847, in company with his brother-in-law, William H. Waldron. Dr. F. Lane was the associate editor. The paper was started to boom Lewiston. Colonel William Garcelon, Alonzo Garcelon's father, brought the printing material from Boston on his ox-team.




NELSON DINGLEY JR.—1855.
A STUDENT AT DARTMOUTH COLLEGE.





NELSON DINGLEY JR.—1855.
A STUDENT AT DARTMOUTH COLLEGE.



port to the Republican party so long as this organization shall be the exponent of the great principles of freedom and justice, and in so far as it shall act judiciously and wisely in carrying these principles out."

Of this important business step Nelson wrote in his diary: "Thus I am launched into an active business life. Thus have I chosen the editorial profession. It is a high and noble profession. It is a position in which one can exert an influence wide and extended for weal or woe. It is a responsible position. It offers innumerable advantages for mental improvement. God grant that my influence may be for good. To Him I look for aid."

The publication of a newspaper in those days was an arduous task. The country editor prepared his editorials, all the local copy, read the exchanges, set much of the type, and directed the newspapers to subscribers. Hand presses were the latest invention, and it took all day to print both sides of a country weekly. What a marvelous stride to the present type-setting-machines and perfecting presses and every conceivable device to save labor!

That year and several years thereafter, Nelson worked early and late, with a firm and intelligent determination to build up the Lewiston Journal. How well he succeeded is now a matter of history.

The important part he took in the national campaign of 1856, and the vigorous way in which he discussed the great problems of that campaign can best be told by quoting a few of the editorials he wrote for the Journal. "On this question (slavery)" he wrote, "Maine has spoken in thunder tones for freedom. Her voice loud and clear has reached every city, every town, every hamlet and every cabin in the Union. She will ever speak thus loudly and thus clearly for free speech, free territory and free men, providing we make a proper use of victory. We have a legislature overwhelmingly Republican—we have a governor in whose wisdom, sound conservatism, free principles, and intellect we have the utmost confidence. We have chosen a united delegation to congress and their voices will ever respond to the claims of sound Republican principles. * * * Once seated in the presidential chair Fremont will roll back the tide of slavery and bring back the government to its original principles." Again he wrote: "Let Fremont speak—To the ballot box on Tuesday—One day for your country—Free soil! Free men! Free speech! Fremont and victory! Freedom expects every man to do his duty."

Every issue of the Journal throughout this campaign contained vigorous and able discussions of important public questions from the pen of this young editor. These editorials were copied in the Republican papers of the state and served as a guide to those who were associated with him in the promulgation of the principles of the new political party that was to secure control of national affairs, free the nation from the curse of slavery and make immortal history.

It was about this time in his life that he first met James G. Blaine. Mr. Blaine had moved to Maine late in 1854 and had become editor and part owner of the Kennebec Journal. Nelson met Mr. Blaine in the winter of 1856 at a gathering of Republicans in the city of Augusta. It was perfectly natural for these two young men, both interested in journalism, to at once strike a harmonious chord in each other's nature and to form a bond of union that time alone could sever. From that first meeting in early manhood, these men became fast friends; and throughout their public career they assisted each other in advancing the interests of the Republican party and the welfare of the state that honored them. Their natures were totally different. Nelson was a retiring, modest and singularly studious young man, while Mr. Blaine was dashing, brilliant and imposing. He was also a man of delightful address, and convincing in his ways. Nelson thus early saw in him a man of promise and great future.

Nelson stated in after years that he secured for Mr. Blaine his first opportunity to make a campaign speech. "We wanted somebody," said he, "to address a meeting over in Litchfield, Me., and I induced Mr. Blaine to go there. This was in the campaign of 1856. He was very much frightened. He had previously addressed a political meeting in Augusta, and had found for the first time that he had a voice. He came over to Lewiston and saw me, and I directed him where to go. He made his speech, and did, I was told, fairly well. I think he said he forgot his prepared speech and was obliged to talk along general lines. After that Mr. Blaine and I were warm personal friends and many times we discussed political matters confidentially."

Mr. Blaine on this occasion, reviewed briefly the history of recent American politics, dwelt upon the dissolution of the Whig party, pointed out the fact that the Democratic party was also on the eve of disintegration, and indicated the necessity of a new political organization as the vehicle of the best and most progressive sentiment of the American people. "The Republican party," said

he, "will march forward in the line of duty and will try to engraft its principles upon the government of the country. They believe that their right to exclude slavery from the free territories is just as clear as their inability to interfere with it in the states; and on that single point, great and far reaching in its effects, we challenge the Democratic party of the south and of the north to a contest for the government of the country." Mr. Blaine then addressed himself directly to the Republicans of his own state. He exhorted them to stand for moral as well as political reform. He attacked the Democrats for their attitude toward the prohibitory law of Maine. In this, Mr. Blaine's first speech, the historian is able to discover the prudence, prescience and ability of the young orator, and also the wisdom of Nelson's choice in the selection of a speaker for the Republican rally at Litchfield.

Newspaper enterprise was in its infancy when Nelson first started in his journalistic career, but an opportunity soon presented itself for the display of his latent talent and genius. The trial of George Knight for the murder of his wife was in progress, and was arousing intense interest. Nelson undertook the publication of a daily edition of the Journal. This daily edition, containing full reports of the trial, had a large circulation, that is about 4,000. The editor was assisted by J. D. Pulsifer, a local shorthand writer, and between them both they prepared very readable reports, all of which are now preserved in the Lewiston Journal office as specimens of admirable newspaper work—condensed, clear, and interesting. Nelson was then twenty-five years old.

James Buchanan was elected president in November of that year. The defeat of Fremont was a great disappointment to the Republicans of Maine and especially to the young editor of the Lewiston Journal who had made such a brilliant fight in the columns of his newspaper. He wrote: "The army of freedom has been repulsed but not conquered. * * * We tremble when we think of the future. If ever there was need of the Republican party, if ever the freemen of the north were called upon to stand firm, now is the time. On them depends the future of this republic.

* * *. Republicans of Maine and of the Union, your country calls upon you for succor in this time of peril. Liberty, bleeding at every pore, holds out her suppliant hand, and beseeches you to gird on your armor for the contest. The struggle in which we have engaged is but just begun. Though repulsed we are not conquered. We have yet an army of unconquered freemen—men who will never say 'die' and whose period of enlistment is for life. We shall

finally conquer. The spirit of freedom yet animates the north." Again he wrote: "Republicans of Maine! Put on your armor and prepare to defend yourselves against the brutal taunts, revilings, insults and aggressions of those lordly allies of the slave power whose battle cry is 'no quarter.' Never before was there so much need of your assistance. Stand firm! Have back-bone!"

As editor of the Journal Nelson was independent in thought and action—that is he declined to indorse the plans of ring politicians who thought more of their own interests than the welfare of the country. He was opposed to the plan of having Governor Hamlin retire in order that he might be re-elected U. S. senator. He was in favor of Lot M. Morrill for that high office, believing that Governor Hamlin could be of greater service to his state by remaining its chief executive. He wrote: "No threats, no attempts to brow-beat us will alter our course in the least. We intend to merit the appellation 'independent' if nothing more."

Governor-Elect Hamlin resigned the office of U. S. senator Wednesday, January 7th, and was inaugurated Thursday, January 8th. He was then re-elected U. S. senator. It was this plan that was objected to by Nelson. He believed that the cause of anti-slavery could best be promoted by Hannibal Hamlin in the governor's chair and Lot M. Morrill in the U. S. senate. Mr. Morrill was early one of the anti-slavery leaders, and his election as senator would have been natural and fitting. However this may be, the fact remains that under the leadership of Hannibal Hamlin the Republicans of Maine carried the state by over 25,000 plurality. Hamlin received 69,574 and Samuel Wells received 43,628 votes. What was left of the old Whig party nominated George F. Patten, who received 6,554 votes.

In the presidential election of that year the Whig, Free Soil, and American parties were largely abandoned, and the new party, called the Republican party, was composed of those abandoning their old party organizations, together with many from the Democratic party. When Governor Hamlin resigned his office as chief executive of the state to accept a seat in the U. S. senate, to which he had been elected by the legislature, Joseph H. Williams, president of the senate, acted as governor for the remainder of the year. While Hannibal Hamlin was governor, for less than two months, Amos Nourse was elected U. S. senator to fill the vacancy. Mr. Hamlin resumed his seat in the U. S. senate the last of February, 1857, his colleague being William Pitt Fessenden, who was elected by the legislature in 1854. It is needless to say that these two po-

litical giants brought honor to their state and the nation. Every representative from Maine, in the 35th congress, which assembled in December 1857, was a Republican. The delegation was as follows: John M. Wood, Israel Washburn Jr., F. H. Morse, Nehemiah Abbott, Stephen C. Foster, Chas. J. Gilman.

During all these years in which Nelson was active in business and politics he still maintained his deep interest in the cause of temperance. He was a delegate to the state temperance convention in Augusta, January 20, 1857. Neal Dow of Portland, the veteran temperance leader, was president of that convention, and from that day to the hour of Mr. Dow's death, these two men were warm friends and ardent supporters of each other in the battle against the grog-shop.

In May, Nelson journeyed to Hudson, Wis., to prove his land claim, and came very near having a fever. He returned home in a month to prepare for the second great step in his career since leaving college—marriage. June 11, 1857 he was wedded to Salome McKenney. The deep feeling of his heart is evidenced by this entry in his diary: "God grant that we may realize all the happiness we anticipate." Of his mother, sad and tearful over her son's departure from the parental roof, he wrote: "Blessed mother! The welfare and happiness of her children were ever uppermost in her thoughts."

Early in May the Lewiston Journal was eleven years old, and in celebrating that event Nelson wrote: "What our course has been in the past, such it will be in the future—ever resisting the extension of human slavery over one inch of territory where it is not protected by state law."

On the 20th of September Nelson purchased Mr. Waldron's half of the Journal and Evangelist and started out in business alone—sole editor and proprietor. The responsibility of conducting a local party paper was great; but Nelson had a way of turning off his work easily. His facilities were inadequate, and he toiled on week after week climbing slowly to the lofty heights he subsequently reached. He was an ardent Republican, a strong anti-slavery and temperance man and an editor of independent and original thought and action. His writings were widely quoted; and throughout these months of toil he was storing his mind with a vast fund of information so useful to him in later years.

From 1857 to 1860, the political events in the state and in the nation were exciting, yea startling. The latter part of June 1857, Lot M. Morrill was nominated for governor and of this event the

Journal said: "His name is an earnest of success." In an editorial on the gubernatorial contest Nelson wrote that "the grand work which the Republican party has commenced, if successfully carried out will end in removing that curse (slavery) which if allowed to extend will finally destroy us as a nation."

The Republican candidate for governor was formerly a Democrat, but he disapproved of the course of his party on the question of slavery in Kansas, and joined the Republican party. The campaign was vigorous and exciting. Before the state election Nelson wrote: "There is no half way ground. Maine is either to do the one thing or the other; her influence is to go either for or against the system of slavery."

In this campaign Nelson took a very active part. He was a delegate to, and one of the secretaries of, the county Republican convention, and made many speeches in the surrounding towns. In September of this year, James G. Blaine, who had been editor of the Kennebec Journal, and was a warm personal friend of the editor of the Lewiston Journal, removed to Portland and there became editor of the Portland Advertiser. Of this Nelson wrote: "Mr. Blaine is one of the most talented and successful editors in the state and we might say in New England."

Mr. Morrill was elected governor in September of that year by 17,000 plurality. He received 60,380 votes, his Democratic opponent, Smith, receiving 42,968 votes. Of this victory Nelson wrote: "Maine has spoken. Again she has proclaimed to the world her devotion to freedom. * * * As the throbbing wires bear the voice of Maine to Washington, the administration, busy over new plans to pacify the slave power, may read the hand writing on the wall, which needs no interpreter to make it the fore-runner of the great victory in 1860. Hear this voice, James Buchanan! Hear it, enemies of freedom, and tremble!"

During this fall and winter Nelson's time was devoted to an earnest discussion of state and national questions. The prohibition of the liquor traffic was assuming great importance as a moral and political question. "Our only safety is an entire sweep of shops which sell liquor for a beverage," wrote Nelson. The 7th of June, 1858, was set apart as a day upon which the voters of the state were to determine whether they should adhere to the policy of prohibition or high license. Of this approaching event he wrote: "The vote is one on which is to depend the future of the temperance cause in this state. Its influence is not to stop here. It will be flashed over the telegraphic wires and will carry encouragement or

dismay to those who are contending for the cause in this state. * * * Could anyone see pictured out before him the long train of evils which proceed from one respectable (?) grog-shop—the poverty and suffering, the bitter tears and lamentations which follow in its path, he would never permit himself to cast a vote to legalize such a pest of society.” The Journal also discussed very ably the Kansas embroglio and the Lecompton constitution. The slavery question and the memorable debates between Lincoln and Douglas were closely followed and ably commented on by the editor, who spoke in no uncertain language of these important questions of the hour.

It is interesting to note that Nelson was one of the first editors in the state of Maine to oppose the old theory that members of congress should be changed every two or four years in order that each county or locality in the district might have its turn. He realized that the standing, influence and usefulness of a member of congress depended upon the length of service his constituents permitted him to have. He realized that no man could make a name for himself in the halls of congress and bring lustre to his state without a reasonably long term of service. Therefore when the matter of selecting a member of congress from that district was discussed, Nelson said that “so important an office as representative to congress should not be a football for every adventurer. We protest against any arbitrary parcelling out of the offices to this or that section.” Maine saw the wisdom of this policy thus early; and to it was due the high standing and national reputation her delegations in congress attained in subsequent years.

In June, 1858, Nelson was chosen a delegate to the Republican state convention which re-nominated Lot M. Morrill for governor. The campaign was fought along lines very similar to the campaign of the year previous. Of the all-absorbing topic of slavery Nelson wrote: “The inference that Christ gave his sanction to the institution of slavery as a political regulation, is not only unwarranted by the facts, but plainly and most decidedly opposed to the spirit of His mission and to the precepts He inculcated. There was no such slavery as that we have at the south, in Palestine, when our Savior was upon earth. Every word that He spoke, every injunction that He gave, was opposed to everything of that nature.”

Governor Morrill was re-elected in the state election of September, 1858, receiving 60,380 votes, his opponent, Smith, receiving 52,440 votes. Six Republican representatives to congress were elected—Israel Washburn Jr., D. E. Somes, John J. Perry, Stephen

C. Foster, F. H. Morse, and Ezra B. French. Stephen Coburn was elected to fill a vacancy caused by the election of Mr. Washburn governor of the state, in September, 1860.

William Pitt Fessenden was re-elected United States senator January 11, 1858; and of this event Nelson wrote; "What makes this choice the more gratifying is the fact that the majority party in the legislature went into the election without making any caucus nomination, and thus unanimously and voluntarily testified their approbation of the public course of Maine's most gifted statesman." The Republican party was further intrenched by the re-election of Gov. Morrill in 1859.

Nelson took an active part in local political discussions, and in the autumn of 1860, held a joint political discussion with Enos T. Luce, Esq., at Leeds. The debate was animated and listened to by a large audience. There are some living now in Leeds who remember this debate, and the force and logic of Nelson's argument. Abraham Lincoln had been nominated for president by the Republicans, and excitement during the campaign was intense. The nation was on the verge of war, and the intense loyalty and patriotism of Nelson was shown in his vigorous editorials. The same year (1860) the grand old Republican, Israel Washburn—Maine's first war governor—who filled the office and performed every duty in such a way as to promote the welfare of the state, strengthen the nation, and win for himself an honorable name, was elected chief executive of the state.

Nelson's domestic life during this period (1857 to 1861) was singularly happy. Two sons were born to his beloved wife, and his correspondence and diary at that time are full of tender passages telling of his devotion to her.

Thus in the midst of these exciting events, when the nation was in the first throes of civil war—Nelson was launched upon his public career. He was well equipped and full of enthusiasm, vigor and courage. He had a well-balanced mind, a cool head, absolute self-control, and industry that was rare. His mind was stored with valuable information. He was a student of history and politics, enjoyed a state reputation as an editor, and knew personally all the public men of Maine who were worth knowing. His success was assured.

The Republican party, which was born when Nelson launched upon the sea of politics, had for its leading features: First: The maintenance of the principles promulgated in the declaration of independence, and embodied in the federal constitution as essen-

tial to the preservation of our republican institutions.—Second: The preservation of the federal constitution.—Third: The preservation of the rights of the states.—Fourth: The preservation of the union of the states.—Fifth: Denial of the authority of congress, of a territorial legislature, of any individual or association of individuals, to give legal existence to slavery in any territory of the United States; hence, opposition to the extension of slavery into free territory.—Sixth: The right and duty of congress to prohibit in the territories those twin relics of barbarism—polygamy and slavery.—Seventh: Arraignment of the Pierce administration, the president, his advisers, agents, supporters, for their high crime in Kansas against the constitution, the union and humanity.—Eighth: Demand for the immediate admission of Kansas as a state in the union with her free constitution.—The policy of this party was fixed and precise. It contained nothing equivocal. It was strengthened and made secure in the hearts of the loyal people by the outrages in Kansas, the Dred-Scott "Opinion," and the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. The struggle for supremacy was between two widely differing civilizations, and was marked by every form of bitterness. The controversies spread to every neighborhood in the north and in the south. The north smarted under a sense of injury, the south under a fear of loss of power. Under such circumstances, and in complications of such portentous character, all dating from the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, the presidential election of 1860 summoned the country to a momentous duty.

CHAPTER V.

1860-1863.

The election of Abraham Lincoln in 1860 was a practical illustration of the effect of the south enforcing the doctrine of slavery and state rights upon the country. Buchanan had looked on quietly but did nothing. The death of Douglas was a great calamity to the Democratic party and to the whole country; for soon after his death the southern sympathizers in the Democratic party began to give expression to the sentiments which had been temporarily silenced by the patriotic outburst that followed the firing on Sumpter. In Maine as early as the middle of June, the Bangor Democrat called on the Democrats of the state "to take a firm and decided stand in opposition to the unconstitutional and despotic warfare waged by Abraham Lincoln on Sovereign states." The Maine Democratic state convention which met at Augusta August 14, 1861, after a sharp fight between the two wings of the party, voted down a resolution "supporting the war so far as it is waged to suppress the rebellion and sustain the constitution and the laws," and by a decisive vote adopted the following: "Resolved that the reconstruction of the Union by force against the embittered feelings and the united strength of nearly one-half of the states is a palpable absurdity and an utter impossibility."

Maine's war governor was Israel Washburn Jr., of Orono. For ten years he had been a member of congress, and had watched the signs of the approaching irrepressible conflict. He was a man of experience and patriotism; and in his inaugural address before the legislature told of the loyalty of Maine in no uncertain words. After discussing slavery and the election of Abraham Lincoln, he

said that "the history of the past shows that no concessions will be accepted as satisfactory which do not secure to the slave states the rights of expression and protection to their peculiar property under the federal constitution. This is what they believe they need, and this alone will satisfy them. I believe I speak the voice of every true, brave and conservative man in the north, when I say that such concessions cannot be made. To grant the concessions demanded would mean the supervision of the constitution. The practical question is whether the laws of the land can be and shall be faithfully executed. In other words it is whether we have a government or not."

But Governor Washburn did not then believe the slave states would withdraw from the Union. He believed the excitement would pass and reason be restored. And other Republican leaders shared this belief. Hannibal Hamlin, who resigned his seat in the United States senate, having been elected vice president with Lincoln, had not given up hope that the civil war might be averted. Lot M. Morrill, who was elected by the legislature to succeed Hamlin in the United States senate, was of the same mind. James G. Blaine, then only twenty-one years old, but giving promise of his future greatness, was speaker of the state house of representatives for the first time; and the session closed before the affair at Fort Sumpter awakened the people of Maine to the awfulness of the situation.

In February, 1861, Nelson joined a party of gentlemen who journeyed to Washington to witness the inauguration of Abraham Lincoln. He was much impressed with the events of that memorable occasion. Kind and sympathetic, he shared the feelings of the burdened executive. Loyal and patriotic, he returned to his journalistic labors with a deeper and more consecrated devotion to the cause of liberty and union.

On the 20th of April, 1861, the week following the fall of Fort Sumpter, Nelson started the Daily Journal. His brother Frank assisted him during the summer in journalistic work, and after his graduation from Bowdoin college in August, became permanently associated with Nelson. It was a good time to launch a daily edition. Excitement was at fever heat. The cry was "to arms! to arms!" Troops were assembling in every northern state, and the intense patriotism of the north was aroused. The summer of 1861

was an exciting one. The sound of the inevitable conflict was heard on every hand. Maine responded, and Lewiston was the recruiting ground for the first company to enlist.¹ Nelson wrote: "Our companies here were the first in the state to tender their services, and the Lewiston Light infantry is the first company to fill its ranks and be accepted and ordered into service by the government. * * * There is a mysterious power in love of country, whenever the people realize that that country is endangered. There is a weird charm in the stars and stripes that has interwoven itself into the very life of the people. It is pleasant once in a while to see the people at the head."

It is an interesting fact that William P. Frye, subsequently member of the national house of representatives and United States senator, went out with one of these companies from Lewiston, and wrote characteristic letters to the Lewiston Journal. Dr. Alonzo Garcelon, subsequently governor of Maine, was surgeon of the regiment and sent to the Journal many interesting letters giving information to the relatives at home of dear ones at the front. Hon. C. W. Walton, then member of congress from that district, and subsequently a member of the Maine supreme court that settled the "count-out" difficulty in January, 1880, was another correspondent who sent "occasionals" to the Journal. Nelson's enterprise in starting the Daily Journal was received courteously by his fellow editors in the state. All wished him success.

It will be remembered that the position of Stephen A. Douglas, on the impending conflict, was a matter of doubt and curiosity; but when that stalwart Democrat decided to cast his lot with the loyal north, there was great rejoicing, and Nelson wrote on the 3rd day of June, 1861, the day following Douglas' death: "With the past political career of Mr. Douglas we have had as little sympathy as anyone; but when on the day after the fall of Sumpter, the news flashed over the wires that he stood by the President in his efforts to preserve the Union inviolate, and called upon Democrats all over the north to come out to the defense of the flag, then no man with a

1—Maine had a glorious record in the civil war. The first company to enlist was the Lewiston Light Infantry. The first and second regiments received special commendation from Secretary of War Cameron. The Colonel of the first regiment was Nat J. Jackson; of the second regiment, Charles G. Jameson, and of the third regiment, O. O. Howard, the hero of Gettysburg. Neal Dow was Colonel of the Thirteenth regiment and J. L. Chamberlain was Colonel of the Twentieth giment. He was one of the heroes of Gettysburg and Petersburg, and took a prominent part in the surrender of Lee. Maine furnished 72,945 men, and lost 7,372 men.

northern heart beating in his bosom could have said anything but 'God bless Stephen A. Douglas.' "

Nelson was a staunch supporter of Israel Washburn Jr., as the people's union candidate for governor of Maine. He said that "all the issues which have divided parties at the north are now suspended or swallowed up in the grand question of the preservation of the union of these thirty-four states; and every citizen who is ready to heartily support the administration in crushing the wicked rebellion against this government, at whatever cost, should stand shoulder to shoulder in this crisis of our nation."

James G. Blaine was chairman of the Republican state committee and as such issued a call for the state convention at Augusta, August 7. At this convention Nelson was made a member of the state Republican committee. Governor Washburn was renominated. The first resolution offered declared that "the present deplorable civil war has been forced upon the country by the disunionists of southern states." A motion was made to lay this resolution on the table. A spirited debate followed in which Nelson spoke against the motion. The Democrats of the state split in their convention. Jameson was nominated by the union Democrats and Dana by the disunion Democrats. The latter convention was of a most dangerous and treasonable character. Union sentiment was hissed.

Nelson was a delegate to the Republican county convention at Auburn and took a very prominent part therein. He had been active in politics and loyal to the cause of the union and was selected as the Republican candidate for representative to the state legislature, September 6, 1861. This convention was held at Auburn hall. T. A. D. Fessenden, with whom Nelson had studied law several years before, was chairman. There was some opposition to the successful candidate as is shown by the fact that he received 46 votes out of 87, his strongest opponent, H. N. Bearce, receiving 34 votes. When waited upon after his nomination, Nelson appeared and accepted the honor in a patriotic and appropriate speech. Hon. C. W. Walton, member of congress from that district, also made a stirring address, and in closing his remarks offered this resolution: "Resolved that the nomination of Nelson Dingley Jr., Esq., with a full knowledge of his open, zealous and patriotic stand in favor of a political union of all who are heartily and sincerely in favor of sup-

porting the administration in its efforts to save the union, and put down the rebellion, is evidence that the Republicans of Auburn are in favor of such a union, and recommend Mr. Dingley to the support not only of Republicans, but to all union men." Nelson was elected by a majority of 178.

Governor Washburn was triumphantly re-elected, receiving 58,689 votes, while the combined vote of Jameson and Dana was 41,736. The state already had two loyal Republicans in the United States senate (Lot M. Morrill and William Pitt Fessenden), and six Republican members of the lower house—John H. Rice, Frederick A. Pike, Charles W. Walton, S. C. Fessenden, John N. Goodwin, and Anson P. Morrill. The legislature was overwhelmingly Republican. In reviewing the members elect to the house Nelson wrote: "Among the Democrats in the house will be Bion Bradbury of Eastport, Democratic candidate for member of congress last year, Shephard Cary of Houlton, for many years a leading Democrat in the legislature, George P. Sewell of Oldtown, former Democratic speaker of the house, A. P. Gould of Thomaston, the Democratic leader of the last house, S. H. Blake of Bangor long a leading Democrat of Penobscot county, and John T. Gilman of Bath, the able editor of the Bath Times. Among the leading Republicans are James G. Blaine of Augusta, one of the ablest editors and debaters in New England and speaker of the last house, William P. Frye of Lewiston a leading member of the last house, General S. P. Strickland of Bangor, Benjamin Kingsbury Jr., of Portland and others." "Altogether," he added, "the house will be composed of decidedly the ablest material of any which has assembled at Augusta for years."

In January, 1862, Mr. Dingley took his seat in the legislature, and assisted in the re-election of James G. Blaine to the office of speaker. It will be remembered that Mr. Dingley had met Mr. Blaine soon after the latter's arrival in the state, and had singled him out as one of the most promising and able young politicians of the state. The close friendship and intimacy which began at this time between these two men continued undisturbed until Mr. Blaine's death in 1893. Speaker Blaine placed Mr. Dingley on the committee on rules, education (chairman) and federal relations—good appointments for a new member.

In this house were William P. Frye, attorney-general of the state in 1867, 1868 and 1869, member of the lower house of con-

gress from 1873 to 1880, and United States senator from 1880 to the present time; Solon Chase, the famous Greenbacker and philosopher and hero of "Them Steers" that played such an important part in the Greenback campaign of 1878; Benjamin Kingsley, author of several law books; John Lynch of Portland, a member of the lower house in the 40th, 41st and 42nd congresses; Samuel H. Blake, an eminent financier; George P. Sewell, an eminent speaker and president of the senate in 1865; S. J. Chadbourne, clerk of the house in 1868, secretary of state in 1876 and 1880, and deputy secretary of state in 1899.

Governor Washburn in his inaugural address to the legislature reviewed the situation in the country. He said among other things that "the loyal people of the United States have resolved in their hearts, and vowed by Him who was their father's God that the union, one and indivisible, shall be preserved, cost what it may. War is not for the abolition of slavery but the preservation of the government. A conditional union man is an unconditional traitor. Up to January 1st, 1862, Maine contributed 16,345 men, 578 more than her quota. It is our fortune to occupy places of trust and responsibility at the time when the questions of the highest import are to be determined—questions reaching to the foundation of human government and affecting the rights of human nature. And it rests largely with those whom the people have honored with their confidence, whether these questions be settled in such a manner that republican institutions shall be established on a firmer basis than ever, or be renounced and abandoned as acknowledged failures."

Mr. Dingley's first act in the legislature was to offer a resolution pledging the support of the state to the national administration. This was on the 27th day of January, 1862. In supporting this resolution he made a short and vigorous speech which "had the ring of true metal." On the 29th of January the resolve in favor of a grant of land to Waterville college, introduced by Mr. Dingley, came up in the house. Mr. Cary of Houlton opposed it and called these colleges "aristocratic institutions." Mr. Dingley in reply said that "he respected an aristocracy of knowledge. Where do your teachers come from but these very aristocratic institutions? Upon what is your republican form of government based but upon the intelligence of the people? And how is this intelligence to be gained but through the teachers? Crush down these 'aristocratic institu-

tions' as the gentleman called them, and you degrade the people and endanger our liberties." Mr. Cary of Houlton was a "sledge hammer debater," as he was called by his admirers in the house, but Mr. Dingley easily overcame him by the use of courteous language and sound logic. The resolution granting the land to Waterville college was passed. On the 27th of February a bill to aid the families of soldiers, which Mr. Dingley largely framed, came up in the house. There was much opposition to it, and it was saved that day by being tabled on motion of Mr. Dingley. On the 2nd of March the bill was taken from the table and debated by the members of the house, many of whom bitterly opposed it. It was entitled, "a bill authorizing towns to aid the families of volunteers and providing that the state should reimburse the expenditures for this purpose, and equalize it on the valuation of all the towns in the state." It was conceded that Mr. Dingley's speech in support of this measure was the ablest of them all, and saved the bill from defeat. He said: "The men who have gone forth from Maine to fight the battles of liberty and union, are periling their lives for Waldoboro' as well as Portland, for Houlton as well as Bangor, for the poorest citizen as well as the richest. It is a service rendered for the whole state and for the protection of the liberty and property of every citizen of the state. * * * Is it right or expedient to impose additional and unequal burdens upon those towns that have done the most and incurred the largest expense in enlisting and fitting soldiers for the war? Is it not a penalty affixed to patriotism, and a bounty upon disloyalty? * * * Such towns should be rewarded rather than punished for their loyalty. * * * There is no difference in the burden of a debt of \$200,000 on the people of the state whether it is considered as a debt on the state as an entity, or on the towns of the state, for the state is only an aggregate of towns. * * * Let us descend from the region of fancy to that of facts and figures. * * * Do the people of the state wish to have it go on record, to remain as a stigma on the otherwise fair fame of our state for all time, that in the crisis of our history, when the enemies of the republic are almost thundering at the gates of the capitol, that Maine thus turned the cold shoulder to the families of the brave men who periled their lives in its defense?" The bill passed March 6th.

Early in February the question of the confiscation of rebel property was occupying the attention of congress and there was a divi-

sion of sentiment with respect thereto. On the 7th of February resolutions relating to national affairs were adopted in the senate and afterwards sent to the house for concurrence, reciting "that we cordially indorse the administration of Abraham Lincoln in the conduct of the war against the wicked and unnatural enemies of the republic, and that in all its measures calculated to crush this rebellion speedily and finally, the administration is entitled to and will receive the unwavering support of the loyal people of Maine; that it is the duty of congress by such means as will not jeopard the rights and safety of the loyal people of the south to provide for the confiscation of the estates, real and personal, of rebels, and for the forfeiture and liberation of every slave claimed by any person who shall continue in arms against the authority of the United States, or who shall in any matter aid and abet the present wicked and unjustifiable rebellion; and that in this perilous crisis of the country, it is the duty of congress in the exercise of its constitutional power to raise and support armies, to provide by law for accepting the services of all able bodied men of whatever status, and to employ these men in such manner as military necessity and the safety of the country may demand."

The leader on the Democratic side of the house was A. P. Gould of Thomaston. On this occasion Mr. Gould spoke on the senate resolutions, opposing them with all his vigor in an elaborate argument. This was the occasion to bring out the latent powers of the future "Plumed Knight" who was now speaker of the house. Mr. Blaine came down upon the floor and made what was considered the most powerful speech ever delivered in the Maine house of representatives. Of this memorable occasion Mr. Dingley wrote: "Mr. Gould of Thomaston then commenced a speech against the resolves and the policy of confiscating rebel slave property. * * Mr. Blaine, speaker of the house, will reply to Mr. Gould and expectation is on tiptoe to hear him, as he is one of the ablest debaters and most skilful parliamentary tacticians in New England." He continued: "Mr. Blaine followed, speaking two hours, and most triumphantly meeting and demolishing the arguments which Mr. Gould had labored so hard and so zealously to establish. It was Mr. Blaine's best effort, and was almost universally pronounced to be one of the ablest if not the ablest and most brilliant speech ever made in the legislature of Maine. * * * The rapid blows which he dealt knocked pillar after pillar of the structure which his

opponent had reared, until at last the whole argument was torn to pieces, and the fallacy and insincerity on which it rested, exposed. The invectives which Mr. Blaine poured forth on Mr. Gould and his hunker sympathizers was scathing beyond description, and frequently called down the house."

Mr. Dingley took great interest in all educational matters, and through his efforts a bill to amend the school laws was framed and passed. Thus in his first session in the legislature he took high rank as an authority on educational matters and on parliamentary law, and as a debater. His speeches were short and pointed. His delivery was natural and graceful but not oratorical. He frequently occupied the chair, called there by the speaker, and presided with dignity and ability.

The Republican state convention of 1862 was held at Portland June 5th. There were four candidates for governor—Abner Coburn, John J. Berry, J. H. Williams, and N. A. Farwell. Abner Coburn was nominated, receiving 330 out of 645 votes. Mr. Dingley was a delegate to this convention and was appointed a member of the state committee. Of this convention he wrote that "the nomination of Abner Coburn means harmony in the Republican ranks. The proceedings indicate a general confidence in the honesty, integrity and ability of the candidate."

The Democrats were divided, as in the year previous, into two factions—those in favor of the war, who nominated C. D. Jameson, and those who were opposed to the war, who nominated Bion Bradbury. In the September election the state again showed her loyalty to the national administration and the union candidate. Abner Coburn, was elected governor by nearly five thousand majority. He received 42,744 votes, while the combined vote of both wings of the Democracy was only 38,872. Four Republican members of congress were elected, including James G. Blaine; and one Democrat, L. D. M. Sweat of Portland.

Mr. Blaine's entrance into national politics was predicted by Mr. Dingley on the 24th of June when he wrote that "Blaine's nomination and election would reflect great credit on the state. We can confidently aver that no other public man combines in larger measure all those qualities of intellect and heart which make an able and successful statesman. In congress he could not fail to take a high and commanding position." Mr. Blaine was nominated for congress July 8th at Waterville. Mr. Dingley was present at the

convention, and was one of the first to congratulate the nominee. Mr. Blaine received 174 out of 181 votes, and the result was greeted with enthusiasm. John L. Stevens, a personal friend of Mr. Blaine's and subsequently minister to the Hawaiian islands, made a vigorous speech while the committee waited upon the nominee. In accepting the nomination Mr. Blaine said: "I will take this occasion to say as the most comprehensive definition of my position, that I shall conceive it to be my duty to stand squarely and unreservedly by the administration of Abraham Lincoln—for in the success of that administration under God rests the perpetuity of the union of these states."

The Democrats of Maine were badly demoralized. The people's convention of Jameson Democrats met at Bangor June 26, 1862. It was a lively gathering. The contest was between the two factions—one in favor of Mr. Jameson's nomination and opposed to any affiliation with rebel sympathizers, and the other in favor of throwing overboard Jameson and taking up a man who would be adopted by the Dana convention to be held in Portland in August. The result for a time was doubtful, but the energy and persistence with which Messrs. Blake, Peters and Jewett fought against the plan of Messrs. Bradbury, Sweat, Fuller and others, finally resulted in victory to the loyal men. The bad blood engendered by this factional fight, however, weakened the Democracy of the state and resulted in the triumphant election of Abner Coburn.

Hon. C. W. Walton, member of congress from the second district, was appointed judge of the supreme court on the 8th day of May; and the district convention to nominate his successor was called for August 8th. William P. Frye, who had served as a member of the state legislature, was a candidate for this vacancy, but early in August, a few days before the convention met, withdrew. Mr. Dingley said of this withdrawal of Mr. Frye: "The Republicans of Androscoggin county would have given him the support which his ability and integrity well merit." When the convention met, Hon. T. A. D. Fessenden was nominated to fill the vacancy, and Sidney Perham was nominated as the Republican candidate for congress in the new second district. On the 30th day of August Mr. Dingley was renominated for the lower house of the state legislature. He received 84 out of 112 votes. He took an active part in the campaign and was elected in September by 170 majority.

The Republican victory in Maine was followed closely by good news from the front. "Give us energy and pluck like that of this glorious week, and we will sing Yankee Doodle and 'Crack our cheeks for the Union,'" wrote Mr. Dingley. September 23rd, under the title "The Morning Dawns" he wrote: "The president has issued a proclamation declaring universal freedom in every state January 1st next. The morning breaks! The beginning of the end of the rebellion is clearly seen. We fight now with God and humanity clearly on our side, and who can resist us? Rally every citizen, around the administration and the government, the stars and stripes above us and God with us; strike for liberty and union, and the victory is ours!" Again: "We should like to hear from Hon. Bion Bradbury, who declared on the floor of the house last winter that he would pledge himself to support the president in everything; also from Hon. L. D. M. Sweat, who said on the floor of the senate he would support the president; and from Hon. A. P. Gould, who argued for three mortal days in the house of representatives that the president alone could emancipate the slaves. * * * * The proclamation will put such men to the test."

President Lincoln's message to congress appeared early in December, and renewed the hope and courage of the loyal north. "Many think the president is slow in reaching the grand consummation," said Mr. Dingley, "but if slow he is sure and to be trusted. God bless Abraham Lincoln."

The year just closing had been memorable in many respects. It had witnessed a turning of the tide against the north and in favor of the south. Abraham Lincoln had issued his famous proclamation. The loyal men of the state of Maine had again pledged their faith in the national administration and sent to the front thousands of her bravest men, and on the last day of the year the hopeful editor wrote: "If the old year expires in gloom the new year stands transfigured before the American people—the hand of God interposed, the hopes of patriots coming to realization. Don't despair. Don't give up the ship. Cling to the promise of God!"

Mr. Dingley again took his seat in the state legislature in January, 1863. At the Republican caucus on the evening of the 6th day of the month, he was unanimously nominated speaker of the house. In this house were: Nathan W. Farwell, a prominent state manufacturer; John W. C. Moore, subsequently in the treasury department at Washington; John L. Swift, lawyer and orator, and Samuel

Cony, governor of Maine in 1864, 1865 and 1866. Mr. Dingley's election to the speakership, at the age of thirty-one by the unanimous voice of his party associates, was a glowing tribute to his candor, decision and comprehensive ability. The Republican members of the house had implicit confidence in his judgment and relied upon him in this critical hour. In assuming the chair he said: "I tender you my grateful acknowledgement for this expression of your confidence. In accepting the position which you have so generously assigned me, I am not insensible to the value of the compliment it bestows and the weight of obligation and responsibility it imposes—a responsibility from which I might well shrink could I not confidently rely on your indulgence and cordial co-operation. In the discharge of the duties of the chair, it will be my aim to administer the rules of the house with fidelity and impartiality, having constantly in view the fundamental principles of parliamentary law, that the great purpose of all the rules and forms by which the business of a legislative body is conducted, while they protect the rights of the minority by guarding against the hasty and irregular acts of majorities, is to subserve rather than to restrain the will of the assembly, to facilitate and not obstruct the expression of its deliberate sense. I am ready, gentlemen, to proceed with the business of the house."

Honorable Abner Coburn, governor-elect, told the situation in national affairs when he said in his annual message to the legislature, that "the total quota of troops demanded of Maine up to this time by the war department, amounts to something less than the number we have actually furnished. The patriotism of our state has even surpassed the demands which the national exigency has made upon it. We have not only sent all the men asked of us, but we have sent good men and brave men. * * * We only claim with others to have done our part. The fact that our quotas have thus been filled, is an honorable proof of the patriotism of our citizens, and will ever form one of the proudest chapters in the history of the state. * * * The object of the war ever has been, still is and of right ought to be, as the president has well declared, the restoration of the constitutional relations between the United States and each of the states. As a loyal man anxious only to do my duty as a citizen and a magistrate, I can see no line of patriotism or no safety, except in a cordial, unreserved support of the policy

inaugurated by the president. * * * If we as a people stand firmly by that policy we shall conquer."

Early in the session F. O. J. Smith of Westbrook offered a peace resolution in the house, and Mr. Dingley wrote concerning Smith's speech: "Smith is a fine orator and a strong man, but exerts little influence. The explanation is to be found in this, that Mr. Smith seems to lose sight of the fact that however selfish men may be as individuals, the masses act in obedience to great moral forces, and if turned against them by prejudice or passion for a time, they surely return to the side of right and justice, with their appreciation of them strengthened and deepened. A man of power and art may seduce the masses once and even twice, by the influence of his massive intellect, and the magnetism of his eloquence, but sooner or later he finds out that his words fall unheeded on the popular ear. It is dangerous for a man or a party to sneer at the sense of right and justice which is in every man's heart, and to attempt to control the public mind by the mere force of will or intellect. Words are a powerful lever in moving the world, but their force depends a great deal upon what kind of a man is behind them."

Mr. Smith's speech began on the 18th of February. The house was crowded, many having assembled to listen to him who was counted one of the most eloquent speakers in the state. He labored to prove that slavery was not the cause of the rebellion. He claimed it was in defense of southern principles, southern measures, and a defense of a southern claim; that slavery is national and freedom sectional. Interest in this great speech subsided on the second day. It was however ingenious and remarkable for its felicity, yet it was unworthy a statesman and calculated to weaken the efforts to crush the rebellion and glaringly in violation of the rules of fair judgment. He represented the war as utterly unproductive and then advocated proposals of peace. He said that New England would be left out in the cold if war continued and that it would then be advantageous for Maine to join the British empire!

Speaker Dingley presided with remarkable ease and grace. He was in fact, an ideal presiding officer. He was prompt, impartial, ever courteous and patient. The business of the house was transacted with decorum and despatch; and when on March 26th, the house was ready to adjourn, this resolution was offered and unanimously adopted: "Resolved, That the thanks of this house are hereby tendered to the Hon. Nelson Dingley Jr., for the marked

impartiality, ability and courtesy with which he has presided over the deliberations of this house and for the kind and generous spirit and the gentlemanly manners which have characterized both his personal and official intercourse with its members."

Mr. Dingley replied: "Gentlemen of the house of representatives: Accept my grateful acknowledgements for this expression of your approval of my official conduct. Whatever measure of success may have attended my efforts to discharge the delicate and responsible trusts imposed upon me, it is largely due to your cordial co-operation and generous forbearance. Allow me to bear witness to the industry, ability and faithfulness which have characterized your legislative labors and to congratulate you on the unusual harmony which has pervaded your deliberations notwithstanding the inevitable conflict of differing opinions and contending interests. The brief period in which we have shared the pleasure of personal intercourse and interchange of counsels will, I am sure, be sacredly cherished in the memory of each member. As you return to your homes let me express the confident hope that each of you will bear with him the consciousness of having honestly endeavored to promote the public weal, a renewed determination to stand by the government in this hour of trial, and the faith that the same over-ruling Providence who has graciously spared the life of every member of the house, during the session which is about to close, will carry the republic safely and triumphantly through the fearful dangers which surround us."

Thus closed his second term in the state legislature.

CHAPTER VI.

1863-1866.

The national election of 1862 had brought some reverses to the Republican party. Maine lost one member of congress. The union forces had met with some disasters and the emancipation of the slaves was looked upon by many as a mistake; but the people of Maine were loyal to President Lincoln. Governor Coburn in his message referred to the freedom of the slaves and said it was wrong to permit the south to use the blacks to accomplish their purpose. "To the most superficial observer," he said, "it has been evident that from the beginning of the war the insurgent states derived their strength from the labor of their slaves. It is their work that furnishes the rebel army with food and clothing, and indirectly with all other supplies—leaving the white population, with trifling exceptions, free to enlist as soldiers. Any policy which can detach the slaves from the rebels and make them a source of weakness rather than of strength, will prove a vital and decisive gain to the loyal side. It is with this view, as a military measure, clearly derived from the war power of the constitution, that the president, as commander-in-chief of the army and navy, issued on the first day of the present month a proclamation declaring all the slaves in the insurgent districts to be free.

The Republican state convention, therefore, met under peculiar and trying circumstances. The call was issued May 18, and the convention was to be held in the city of Bangor on the first day of July. As a member of the state committee Mr. Dingley signed the call. An immense crowd, including many Democrats, attended the convention. There were a thousand delegates and excitement was

at fever heat. Each session provoked long and continued discussion. Undoubtedly Governor Coburn desired a renomination, but in his behalf Mr. Blaine told the convention that Governor Coburn did not desire to embarrass the party. The state committee held an all-night session on the night of June 30th and Mr. Dingley was one of the chief advisers in that secret conference. The situation was carefully canvassed and all the differences were finally settled, the decision being in favor of the nomination of Samuel Cony. The convention met and Samuel Cony received 474 votes and Abner Coburn 418 votes. J. H. Williams also received 176 votes. Thus the friends of Governor Coburn evidently were not willing to have their candidate set aside. There was no choice; but with a view to harmony Gov. Coburn's name was withdrawn and Samuel Cony nominated by acclamation. Judge Cony was a Union Democrat, and this accounts for much of the opposition which he received in the convention and which rallied to the support of Governor Coburn. The convention adjourned but the best of feeling did not prevail.

The dark days between 1862 and 1863 were accompanied by opposition to all patriotic measures by the northern Democrats in congress, few union victories in the field, and a resistance of the draft. Had it not been for the union victory at Gettysburg and the capture of Vicksburg, it is more than probable that the north would have been so far divided as to have made a successful prosecution of the war impossible. The union cause was weakened, and the rebel papers copied reports of northern Democratic conventions. It was with great difficulty that union bonds were sold.


The state campaign was interesting and exciting. Mr. Dingley labored vigorously with voice and pen for the union cause and the Republican ticket. President Lincoln's policy was fiercely assailed by the Democrats. Republican mass meetings were held at different points in the state; and on the evening of July 8th, a gigantic mass meeting was held in City hall, Lewiston, to celebrate the fall of Vicksburg, and to arouse the Republican hosts of Maine to a full realization of the political importance of that victory. This important event (the fall of Vicksburg), Mr. Dingley wrote "was the most glorious celebration of the Fourth of July we have had since the day was first made glorious! God bless Unconditional-Surrender Grant!" Mr. Dingley spoke at the mass meeting of

July 8th and was among the first to see that the tide of success was setting toward the union cause, President Lincoln and the Republican party.


The draft in the second district commenced in Lewiston July 15, 1863. There was a large audience in the City hall. The best of feeling prevailed. Daniel Holland turned the big wheel, and Dr. Alonzo Garcelon drew out the first card. The names as they were drawn out received cheer after cheer from the crowd.

In the latter part of July Mr. Dingley had his first and only experience as a soldier. He was slight in stature, frail and almost delicate in health. His arduous labors in the editorial chair, on the stump and in the state legislature had exhausted him. On the 21st of July news came of an incipient rebellion in Franklin county. Attempts were made to resist the draft "by a drunken sesech mob." The mob drove away the officers who were to serve notices on the drafted men and gave them fifteen minutes to leave the town. Mr. Dingley was a member of the Lewiston company of militia and responded to the orders of the governor of the state to march to Kingfield. July 23rd the company left for Farmington amid great excitement. The streets were thronged as the soldiers marched to the train, and loud were the cheers as the train rolled away. Farmington was reached at six o'clock in the afternoon. The boys slept in tents and at six o'clock on the morning of the 24th started for Kingfield. The company found everything quiet in that village, and did nothing but camp out on the 25th. The campaign being over, and peace restored, the soldier boys returned to Lewiston July 26th and were received with fitting honors. Before their departure from Kingfield, the citizens of the village provided a collation on the village square for everybody. Private Dingley made a speech thanking the people of Kingfield for their hospitality. The cap and uniform Mr. Dingley wore, and the musket he carried on this memorable occasion, were interesting relics in the family homestead for years after; and the owner of them was very fond of relating the amusing incidents of the Kingfield campaign in which "he fought, bled and died for his country."

On the first day of April of this year Mr. Dingley moved from Auburn to Lewiston (across the Androscoggin river) having purchased the old Packard house on Main street. Here he spent many of the happiest years of his life. Here his children, so dear to him,



LOT M. MORRILL, SAMUEL WELLS.
A. P. MORRILL, ABNER COBURN.



were reared. Here he spent his spare moments in a little garden, planting with his own hands beans, corn, cucumbers and other garden truck. Here the greater part of his life in Maine was spent, until he was called to higher duties in Washington. He was pre-eminently a domestic man. He loved his home, his family; and in this humble but comfortable abode, he sought and obtained that peace and contentment, that calm and serenity that always marked his earthly career.

Notwithstanding he had changed his place of residence, six months thereafter, on the 4th day of September, he was nominated for representative to the state legislature by the Union party of Lewiston. He received 144 out of 253 votes. This nomination was a surprise to him. He preferred to have the honor conferred upon another; but having accepted the nomination he entered the campaign with unusual zeal. He spoke at several places in the county, taking the stump on several occasions with Dr. Alonzo Garcelon. Some of the notable speakers in that campaign were William Pitt Fessenden, William P. Frye, James G. Blaine, and Hannibal Hamlin. The state election was held September 14th and Mr. Dingley was elected by over 600 majority. Samuel Cony received 68,339 votes while Bion Bradbury, the Democratic nominee, received 50,676 votes. The total vote in the state was 119,042, which was 37,300 more than in 1862, and the Republican vote was increased by 23,600, the Democratic by about 13,700. So the Republican or Union party had good reason to rejoice. Mr. Blaine telegraphed President Lincoln as follows:

"Maine sustains your administration by a loyal majority of over 15,000 votes."

He received the following laconic reply:

"Thanks! Both for the good news you send and for the sending of it."

A. Lincoln.

The example set by Maine was followed by other states in November, and the way was paved for the renomination and re-election of Lincoln in 1864.

The state campaign over, Mr. Dingley in company with President Cheney of Bates college, started for Washington and the front. They left Lewiston October 16; visited Fairfax seminary hospital near Alexandria, Virginia; stopped with Major Wares; visited the old capitol prison; visited the union army at Gainesville, stopping at a seesech house; visited Bull Run battle-field; dined with

General Kilpatrick; was sent by him to Warrenton, the headquarters of the army; stopped with the Fifth Maine regiment; attended a rebel church; visited General Meade's headquarters; also General Sedgwick's headquarters; attended services with the Seventh Maine regiment; stopped with Col. Mason of the Seventh; visited General Pleasanton's headquarters, and returned to Washington by way of Gainesville. On the 27th of October he had an interview with President Lincoln at the White House, and in after years he often referred to this interview. He was introduced to the President by Senator Morrill; and after the senator had graciously retired, President Lincoln talked with Mr. Dingley for over an hour. "In some unaccountable manner," said Mr. Dingley, "the President unbosomed himself to me and talked freely about the war and the great national crisis." This interview impressed Mr. Dingley greatly and gave him a valuable knowledge of Lincoln's character.

January 6, 1864, he took his seat in the state legislature for the third time. He was again elected speaker of the house by acclamation. John A. Peters, afterwards chief justice of the supreme court of Maine, presided over the Republican caucus. In assuming the chair for the second time Mr. Dingley said: "Permit me to express the confident hope that your deliberations may be conducted with that harmony, wisdom and faithfulness which befits the representatives of the people of a great state and which is especially demanded by the exigencies of the nation. In the great progress which the national cause has made during the past year there is every encouragement to renewed efforts in the defense of a periled country, and abundant cause for thankfulness for the special favor shown our country by the Ruler of Nations. Whatever doubts as to the result of this struggle for national existence any may have entertained in the past, the question may now well be regarded as settled that the American Republic is to come forth from the baptism of fire and blood, through which it is passing, preserved and purified, redeemed and disenthralled."

In this house were: Edward T. Little, who founded the Little High school in Auburn; Eben Jordan Jr., of the famous family of merchants; John Lynch, a member of the fortieth, forty-first and forty-second congresses; Nathan Webb, afterwards judge of the United States district court; F. O. J. Smith, a prominent railroad promoter; John A. Peters, attorney-general of the state from 1864

to 1867, a member of the fortieth, forty-first and forty-second congresses and chief justice of the supreme court of Maine; and John H. Burleigh, a member of the forty-third and forty-fourth congresses.

Governor Cony paid a glowing tribute in his inaugural address to the dead Maine soldiers. He said that "if this war were one of mad ambition, glory would afford no compensation for its manifold woes."

In the month of February the session of the legislature was made unusually interesting by the presence of Generals Howard and Burnside who addressed both houses on the great conflict then in progress. On the 2nd day of March there was a joint convention of the Union members of the legislature. Resolutions were adopted favoring the renomination of Lincoln and Hamlin. There was some talk (privately to be sure) of omitting Hamlin's name on the ground that the real feeling of the state was for Andrew Johnson for vice president; but only five or six votes were recorded against the resolution.

Much time was given in this session of the legislature to putting an end to the payment of a bounty by the state to every volunteer for three years on Maine's quota in the army and navy. The result was a discontinuance of the old system under which many abuses had arisen. March 25th the house adjourned late at night and resolutions of thanks to the speaker and other officers of the house were offered by John M. Goodwin of Biddeford. Speeches were made by Messrs. Goodwin, Webb and Williams. Speaker Dingley replied briefly and the important and memorable session was over.

Returning from his labors in the legislature, Mr. Dingley at once plunged into editorial work. Excitement was intense. Extra editions of the Lewiston Journal were read eagerly by the people in Lewiston and Auburn and surrounding towns. There was tremendous interest in General Grant's movements towards Richmond and around Petersburg. In the midst of this excitement the state and district conventions were called and the people were plunged into another campaign. The Union district convention met in Auburn May 10th, 1864, to select two delegates to the Union convention at Baltimore. The resolutions adopted at this convention were framed by Mr. Dingley, and the language used allowed

no doubt as to the loyalty of their author or the people he represented.

In the midst of this heated condition of the state the Republican state convention was held at Augusta June 29th. Samuel Cony was nominated for governor. There was no compromise in the platform. Lincoln and Johnson, the national ticket, was supported, notwithstanding Maine's beloved statesman, Hannibal Hamlin, had been rejected and Andrew Johnson nominated in his place. Sidney Perham, who had been elected to the 38th congress (1863-64) was renominated for the 39th congress by the Republicans of the second district. Mr. Dingley was renominated for the state legislature by acclamation on the first day of September. On the evening of the day on which he was renominated, he addressed a political gathering in the village of Greene, with William P. Frye. He entered this exciting campaign with greater zeal than ever, realizing the importance of adding his no small influence to the Union cause. The speakers in that campaign were many and prominent. Among them were Hannibal Hamlin, John A. Peters, William P. Frye, William D. Kelley and Sidney Perham. Mr. Dingley also found time during this exciting period to attend and address a family reunion at Durham, his birthplace, to assist in the formation of the Maine state editorial association of which he was elected the first president, and to address a Union Thanksgiving meeting September 11, to render thanks for recent victories in the field. The state election occurred September 12, and the Union ticket was elected by a rousing majority. Governor Cony received 65,583 votes, and Joseph Howard, Democrat, 46,403 votes. Five Republican members of the lower house of congress were elected—John Lynch, Sidney Perham, Fred A. Pike, John H. Rice and James G. Blaine. There was great rejoicing all over the state. Mr. Dingley was re-elected to the legislature by 632 majority. It was a great Union victory causing a thrill of joy throughout the Union states. It seemed to settle all doubt as to the result of the national election in November. There was comparatively little interest over the presidential election. Senator Morrill and Congressman Blaine addressed the only large Union rally in Lewiston during the campaign. This was on the night of November 3rd, a week before the election.

Late in September glorious tidings came from the front. General Grant had raised the cry "On to Richmond." Sheridan was

pursuing Early and the tide of battle was rising in favor of the north. The elections in Pennsylvania and Indiana had given hope to the Republicans and the Union cause. "Such a sweep," wrote Mr. Dingley, "completely upsets all the calculations of the copper-head leaders and leaves McClellan without the ghost of a chance.

* * * Not even in his great victories and almost unparalleled campaigns has Grant proved his ability and genius more conclusively than in his choice of men to lead the various armies that are operating against the rebellion." The series of good reports closed with Sheridan's great victory in the Shenandoah.

The election was held November 8th; and on the morning of the 9th, an extra edition of the Journal announced a complete and sweeping Union victory. The cry that the "war was a failure," was itself a failure. Lincoln carried Maine by 25,000 majority and Mr. Dingley observed that "the re-election of President Lincoln by a most overwhelming majority settles beyond controversy that the American people are firmly and unflinchingly resolved to prosecute this war on their part until the people of every state shall acknowledge and obey the authority of the union. Whether it takes three months or three years longer, the people will not give up the contest until the republic is saved." Lincoln received 213 electoral votes and McClellan 21. This was followed on November 14 by the resignation of General George B. McClellan, which act was approved by President Lincoln. October 19, Philip H. Sheridan, who, "under the blessing of Providence averted a great national disaster and achieved a brilliant victory at Cedar Run," was made major general.

The state legislature was overwhelmingly Republican, and was to elect a successor to William Pitt Fessenden who had been appointed secretary of the treasury by President Lincoln in the spring of that year. Mr. Dingley commented thus: "We do no injustice to Mr. Hamlin's industry, ability and faithfulness as a public servant when we indicate our desire that Fessenden should be re-elected. Hamlin received evidence of continued confidence by indorsement by the state legislature. Fessenden should receive a similar expression of confidence by re-election. It is a great injury to the state to discard our ablest statesman and leader of the senate." Hannibal Hamlin, having been rejected by the national Republican convention as a candidate for vice president, was now in private life, and his friends desired to return him to the senate.

Mr. Fessenden had been prevailed upon to retire from the senate and take a position in President Lincoln's cabinet. Mr. Hamlin's friends wanted Mr. Fessenden to retain his position as secretary of the treasury. Mr. Dingley said that "Fessenden declined a position in the cabinet for several reasons, but finally accepted it with reluctance. If Fessenden could have foreseen that advantage was thus to be taken of him, he would have remained where he was. Hamlin's renomination for vice president was urged for the very reason that it would avoid an unpleasant contest between him and Fessenden."

The legislature met January 4th and Mr. Dingley took his seat in the house for the fourth time. He was unanimously tendered a renomination for speaker by the Republicans, but declined. He preferred to serve on the floor. In this house were: John L. Stevens, once a partner of James G. Blaine in the Kennebec Journal and later minister to the Hawaiian Islands; Edward Wilson, a prominent Democratic leader; M. V. B. Chase of Augusta, subsequently on Gov. Dingley's staff; and Samuel F. Hersey, the millionaire. W. A. P. Dillingham of Waterville was elected speaker. Governor Cony told the situation in the state when in his inaugural address he said: "The debt of the state is represented by loans amounting to \$5,337,000. The bounty laws of the state, which have led to much abuse, should be revised. Maine enlisted 13,620 men in 1864. The President has made another demand of 300,000 men to be enforced by a draft after the 15th of February. The military position of the country is such as to afford encouragement that this requisition will be met with alacrity. The staggering blows recently dealt upon the military power of the rebels in the west and south, furnish a cheerful augury that the end is approaching. The presidential canvass was earnest and exciting. The policy and measures of the government were assailed with severe and bitter criticisms. Lincoln's nomination was the signal for more impetuous assaults. The Democratic convention made the issue clear. It proclaimed the war a failure, and demanded a peace convention. The re-election of Lincoln was in no sense a personal or party triumph—it was the result of a national necessity. That a nation, where each man is a sovereign, and every voter an integral part of the government, in which every ballot cast, as in the late election, is a verdict upon the past, and combining in a majority, a

decree for the future, binding the whole nation, majorities as well as minorities, individuals and masses, to meet the sacrifices and bear the burdens of continued war, is a marvelous testimony to the steadiness of popular government and the capacity of mankind to sustain it. Since the day which heralded the advent of our Saviour none more glorious has dawned on our race than the 8th of November, 1864." Mr. Dingley was appointed a member of the committee on rules, judiciary and federal relations.

In the Republican caucus for United States senator the friends of Mr. Hamlin withdrew his name, conceding to Mr. Fessenden a large majority. Fessenden was unanimously nominated, and Mr. Dingley wrote to the Journal: "While Maine has, as it seems to me, done honor to herself and justice to her ablest statesman, she has by no means discredited Mr. Hamlin, whose ability, faithfulness and public services she is justly proud of, and whom she will delight to honor in the future as she has done in the past." Mr. Fessenden resumed his seat in the United States senate March 4, 1865, and died September 8, 1869.

Mr. Dingley was the recognized leader of the Republicans in this house. On the 20th day of January he presented a resolution in favor of an amendment to the federal constitution providing for the abolition of slavery. In presenting this resolution he said "he thought it eminently fit that Maine should at this time speak and then throw the weight of her influence in favor of this vital measure. The extent of that influence depends largely upon the promptness and spontaneity and heartiness evinced."¹ He moved that the rules be suspended and the resolution placed upon its immediate passage. The resolution declared "that the people of Maine, believing that the institution of slavery is the chief obstacle to an early and permanent pacification of the country, and impressed with the conviction that our duty to God and our fellow men demands that so foul a blot should be removed from every rod of the soil of the American republic, are ardently desirous that congress should immediately submit to the several states a proposition to amend the constitution of the United States so as to abolish slavery in the confident hope that the amendment will be ratified by the requisite number of states, and that thereby the source of our national woes and the stigma on our national fame may be consti-

¹—This speech was regarded at the time by those who heard it as one of the most effective ever made in the state house.

tutionally removed, and the blessings of a substantial peace, a real union, and a strong nationality secured."

Mr. Payson of Westbrook opposed the motion to suspend the rules. He made a speech of nearly an hour, directed against ministers, abolitionists, etc. As a fitting reply to Mr. Payson's speech Mr. Dingley introduced to the house a little slave girl, recently in Portland, Lewiston and other places in Maine, as one of the fruits of the "peculiar institution" which the gentleman had been defending. The rules were suspended by a vote of 98 to 14 and the resolution was approved by the governor January 27th. February 1st, 1865, two-thirds of both houses of congress approved, by resolution, the anti-slavery amendment; and February 7th, 1865, the Maine house of representatives passed by a vote of 103 to 15, a bill ratifying the proposed amendment to the constitution. There was tremendous enthusiasm. The areas and galleries of the chamber were filled with ladies and gentlemen. A band was stationed in the gallery and when the vote was announced, every Union member present voted "yes." The chair declared that by this sublime act Maine gave her ratification to the amendment to the constitution "which drives forever from the land the curse of slavery. God save the state of Maine." There was great applause. The band played the national hymn and during a recess of half an hour cheers were given for Lincoln, for the rights of man, for Grant, for Sherman, Sheridan, Thomas and Farragut—also for the brave soldiers. The fifteen Democrats were silent. Mr. Chase of Dover, one of them, proposed three cheers for the old Union. Mr. Webb of Portland said: "It was good until the slavery minions spoiled it." Then all cheered. Finally three cheers were given for the constitution as amended and the Union as it will be. Several patriotic speeches were made, and Mr. Dingley proposed that "in view of the great triumph over which we rejoice, the assemblage unite in singing that grand old doxology 'Old Hundred.'" It was sung with intense spirit and unconcealed tears. Thus Maine ratified the thirteenth amendment to the federal constitution: "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States or any place subject to her jurisdiction."

The question of bounties occupied much of the attention of this legislature. Early in February Mr. Dingley offered a resolution "that the committee on judiciary inquire what further legislation,

if any, is needed to secure to towns their equal rights under the present laws relative to the payment of state bounties." The then existing law concerning bounties gave rise to much abuse. The names of fictitious men were sent in as volunteers and the state found itself paying bounties for men who did not exist. February 10, Mr. Dingley offered an amendment to prohibit the payment of bounty for paper men. He wanted to uproot the whole system. The amendment was adopted and the bill passed. The effect of this law was to legalize all past acts of towns in voting, paying or offering to pay bounties without regard to the sum, authorizing towns to thereafter vote bounties to fill the present call not exceeding \$300 for one year's men, and \$100 for each additional year, but prohibiting them from thereafter paying bounties for the assignment of such classes of "paper men" as properly belong to the general credit of the state without the payment of bounties. It is interesting to note that the investigations relating to the payment of bounties to paper men made by this legislature (inaugurated by Mr. Dingley), led to a complete inspection and investigation of the state paper credits in 1871. George F. Talbot and Selden Connor, a committee appointed for that purpose, made a report and published it in book form. The legislature finally adjourned February 25th.

Exciting and important events followed close upon each other in the spring and summer of 1865. The community in which Mr. Dingley lived was intensely loyal, and he was one of the leaders. He was foremost in public affairs and was held in high esteem by all. On the 4th day of March the Union men and women of Lewiston held a jubilee meeting to celebrate the second inauguration of Abraham Lincoln. Mr. Dingley presided and made a patriotic address. Large editions of the Journal were issued in the early part of April announcing Grant's triumphant success in breaking Lee's line. April 3rd information reached Lewiston of the evacuation of Petersburg and Richmond. The people seemed to suspend business, so great was the joy, and so intent were all over the result of the terrible conflict. Day by day came reports of Lee's flight and the Union pursuit; and on April 10th the people of Lewiston were thrown into a frenzy of excitement by the report that Lee had surrendered! The bells were rung and cannon fired; in the evening nearly every residence was illuminated; flags were raised and salutes fired in honor of the close of the war for the preservation of

the Union. William P. Frye was mayor and presided at the jubilee meeting. But joy was turned into sorrow; for on the morning of April 15, came the sad intelligence that President Lincoln had been assassinated the previous night. Flags were placed at half mast and the stores and buildings were draped in mourning. On the following Sabbath the churches were draped and eulogies pronounced. In the afternoon a union meeting was held at the Main street Free Baptist church presided over by Mayor Frye. April 19th, the day of the funeral, was observed in Lewiston by an eulogy from Rev. Mr. Wood.

National affairs that spring and summer overshadowed state affairs, and little attention was paid to the state convention and the state election. Governor Cony was renominated by the Republicans, and Joseph Howard by the Democrats. The former was re-elected to a third term by about 12,000 majority.

The Maine Republican state convention in August, 1865, held in Portland, while expressing approval of President Johnson's utterances in favor of punishment of treason, and equal rights, at the south, resolved that the rights of suffrage should be given to the loyal colored men. The Maine Democratic state convention approved of President Johnson's policy of reconstruction, realizing that it would divide the Republican party. The Democrats said that nothing remained but to admit senators and representatives from the south. The Republicans contended that the rebellion had put the confederate states practically out of the Union. Charles Sumner and Thad Stevens and some others, took the ground that it would be wiser to hold the late rebel states as territories. After a long struggle, on June 13th, both branches of congress submitted to the states the fourteenth amendment to the constitution. President Johnson took exceptions to the amendment in a brief message to congress, in which he maintained congress had no right to propose amendments while the eleven late rebel states were unrepresented. This increased the gulf of separation between himself and the Republicans which had been previously made by his veto of the civil rights bill and of the bill to continue the Freedman's bureau, both of which were passed over his objections. President Johnson's speech on Washington's birthday, in which he denounced Sumner, Stevens and others as traitors, and declared he would carry out his own program, embittered the feeling against him.

Mr. Dingley's journalistic labors during this exciting period were arduous, but his health was on the whole excellent. In the midst of his duties he found time to hear Henry Ward Beecher preach in Brooklyn, and to visit General Sherman at West Point. On the Fourth of July he delivered an oration at Gardiner.¹ Late in July he went to Bothwell, Canada, where there were rumors of "money in oil." The fall and winter of 1865 and 1866 he devoted largely to journalistic and other literary work.

By reason of his success as a state legislator and political adviser, Mr. Dingley was, in 1866, looked upon as an available candidate for congress. He had a wide circle of warm and influential friends, who were proud of him and his record. He was urged to allow the use of his name as a candidate for congress. But there was another rising politician in Lewiston who had served in the state legislature, and had taken high rank as a political campaigner. His name was William P. Frye. Mr. Frye also had many warm admirers, and was ambitious. Enos T. Luce, a prominent lawyer and politician of Lewiston was also ambitious to serve his district in the lower house of congress. The result was a conference between the three men, at which it was agreed to submit the question as to which should be the Republican candidate from Androscoggin county, to a committee consisting of Messrs. N. Morrill, Lee Strickland, Ruel Washburn, Augusta Sprague, J. S. Lyford, S. I. Abbott, Jeremiah Dingley, T. A. D. Fessenden, and Job Prince. This committee met on the evening of April 26th, and after a spirited conference, both Mr. Dingley and Mr. Frye were retired and Mr. Luce chosen as the candidate to be presented to the district convention. There was considerable feeling over the result and many charges, probably all groundless, were made. Mr. Dingley acquiesced in the result of the conference with his usual good nature, and labored for the nomination of Mr. Luce. But the district convention which met June 28th was a surprise. The name of Mr. Luce was withdrawn and the convention re-nominated Sidney Perham who had already served two terms in the lower house of congress. The Androscoggin county delegation did not vote.

Between the district and the state Republican conventions, Mr. Dingley found time to visit Washington. Franklin Simmons, the famous Maine sculptor, was at that time making a bust of General

1—See Appendix.

Grant, and was having sittings at his studio. At Mr. Simmons' invitation, Mr. Dingley called at the studio to meet the famous general. He was introduced to Grant as the editor of the *Lewiston Journal* and a prominent Maine Republican. The conversation led to the war and politics. It is needless to say that Mr. Dingley, with true newspaper instinct, mentally noted everything that General Grant said and later embodied his statements in a letter to the *Journal*. This letter was published in the *Journal* May 12, 1866. It was headed—"An Hour with Grant." It read as follows:

"We had the good fortune yesterday to meet General Grant at the studio of Maine's gifted artist, Simmons, and spend an hour in conversation with the Lieutenant General while he was giving Mr. S. the benefit of a sitting. As everything coming from the General who led our armies to victory over rebellion is of interest to the public, and particularly so at this time when his name is mentioned in connection with the next presidency, we propose to give our readers a brief resume of Grant's conversation. The General, who was dressed in a plain black, civilian suit, had hardly removed his hat from his head before he took a cigar from his pocket, lighted it and began to puff out wreaths of smoke.

"I am breaking off from smoking," remarked Grant. "When I was on the field I smoked 18 or 20 cigars a day, but now I smoke only nine or ten."

"Seating himself and turning towards the clay model of himself which the artist was building up, Grant remarked: 'If you had been at Vicksburg when we were before that city, you would not have wanted for mud.' This naturally opened the way to a conversation on the events of the war which we improved. Grant referred to the series of battles which relieved Chattanooga and put that important strategic point securely in our possession, as one of the most satisfactory of his achievements in a purely military point of view. Referring to a criticism made by a historian Grant said:

"This is a revival of the exploded theory of subduing the rebellion by peace measures. A half million troops might have been kept within sight of Washington until doomsday and the rebellion would have flourished more and more vigorously day by day. Fighting, hard knocks only, could accomplish the work. The rebellion was to be overcome, if overcome at all, by force; its resources destroyed; its fighting material obliterated, before peace could be obtained. It was the constant pounding which we gave

Lee's army from the Rapidan to the James that made possible the victories of April 1865. There were but two failures in the Virginia campaign of 1864 which ought to have been successes. And these were the failures to capture Petersburg when we crossed the James, and afterwards the mine explosion. But these were all for the best, for had we succeeded at either time Lee would have at once been obliged to abandon Richmond, and would have been able to secure a safe retreat into the interior of the south where he would have prolonged the contest for years.' Grant said he was surprised at the suddenness of the collapse of the rebellion. Some parts of the country needed the blighting effects of war to bring the people to a realizing sense of the enormity of their crime. 'Lee is conducting himself badly,' said General Grant. 'The bitter feeling would die out sooner if leading men did not look upon treason as very bad. They think the southern cause will triumph in politics. The mischief-makers in the north should stop. The south will then acquiesce. I would seize the New York News and kindred sheets that are giving out dangerous ideas as to the rights of the south. The troops must be kept in the south. It is thought that the French invasion of Mexico is a part of the rebellion. I believe that troops ought to be sent down to drive Maximillian out.'

"We left General Grant more deeply impressed than ever before of his great ability, his unflinching patriotism, and his thorough devotion to liberty and justice."

The questions of public interest then were, the conduct of President Johnson and the matter of selecting a candidate for president in the next Republican convention. The statement of General Grant obtained by Mr. Dingley and published in the Journal, was copied by the newspapers of the country and commented on freely. Republican leaders thought it was a confession from Grant that he would probably be a candidate for the Republican nomination for president. The article created a great sensation in the political world, and appears to have annoyed Gen. Grant. The latter did not object so much to the interview itself but to the fact that the public gathered from the article a secret which Grant himself had confided to only a few of his close friends. In other words it was a premature announcement of his candidacy for the presidency. General Grant interviewed Mr. Blaine about the matter and Mr. Blaine wrote the editor of the Journal. The latter with

his usual courtesy, expressed his regret that Gen. Grant had been annoyed over the interview, but justified his publication of the article on the ground of newspaper enterprise and the fact that the General was introduced to him as an editor presumably seeking the latest political news. At all events the Lewiston Journal beat the whole newspaper fraternity in announcing General Grant's probable candidacy for president.

Mr. Dingley attended the Republican state convention that nominated General Joshua L. Chamberlain for governor on the 21st of June. He also attended commencement at Waterville college August 7th, presided over the Androscoggin county convention August 23rd, and entered the state campaign five days later.

CHAPTER VII.

1866-1873.

The state campaign of this year (1866) was not unusually exciting. It was conceded that the Republicans would carry the state. The civil war was over and the Democratic party had nothing but a lost cause behind it and a hopeless future before it. Among the notable speakers of this campaign was N. P. Banks, speaker of the national house of representatives in the 34th congress (1871-1873). Mr. Dingley made seven political addresses in this campaign, one with Mr. Frye at North Auburn and one with Congressman Perham at Mechanic Falls. ¹ The campaign closed September 8th, and when the votes were counted Joshua L. Chamberlain was elected by an overwhelming majority, receiving 69,637 votes, Eben F. Pillsbury, the Democratic candidate, receiving 41,947 votes. Five Republican members of congress were elected—Fred A. Pike, John A. Peters, John Lynch, James G. Blaine, and Sidney Perham. There was great rejoicing throughout the state. Of this victory Mr. Dingley said: "The result of the election is such as to cheer the hearts of patriots and carry consternation to Andrew Johnson."

Mr. Dingley's time was fully occupied in the winter, spring and summer of 1866 and 1867. Besides giving general editorial supervision to the Journal, he delivered the address at the dedication of the high school at Lisbon Falls, assisted in securing the appointment of William P. Frye as attorney general; addressed state tem-

1—Mr. Perham says that frequently Mr. Dingley, Mr. Frye and he addressed political meetings together. Mr. Perham always led off with a short introductory speech. Mr. Dingley spoke next giving sound logic and thought, while Mr. Frye closed and stirred the audience to a high pitch of enthusiasm.

perance conventions and legislative committees and assisted in founding a Young Mens' Christian association in Lewiston. In the latter part of January he attended a state temperance convention at Augusta, and was appointed temporary chairman. On the 14th of March he took the second and third degree of Good Templars, and on the 10th of April was elected grand worthy templar of the state Good Templars. The latter part of March the city officials of Lewiston held a banquet at City hall and Mr. Dingley responded eloquently to the toast "State of Maine." In August, finding his health somewhat impaired by his varied and arduous duties, he made a horseback tour through the White Mountains with Rev. Dr. Balkam, pastor of the Congregational church of Lewiston. He rode through Waterford, Lovell, Fryburg, North Conway, Fabyans, Bethlehem, Plymouth, Tamworth, N. H., where he addressed a Sunday school convention, Bridgeport Center, Mechanic Falls, returning home on the 20th of August.

The question of temperance and prohibition was always dear to Mr. Dingley's heart; and late in August he consented to be a candidate for representative to the state legislature to fight the liquor interest. The "rummies," as he called them, were opposed to his nomination and election; and he observed that "the rum interest is opposing me, but I am determined to fight it out." In later years he said: "This was perhaps the hardest contest in my political career." He did fight it out, and was nominated in spite of the "rummies;" and on the 9th day of September was triumphantly elected. In this state election Governor Chamberlain was re-elected, receiving 57,332 votes. Eben F. Pilsbury, the Democratic candidate, received 45,990 votes.

From the day of the state election to January 1, 1868, Mr. Dingley was busy delivering lectures before lyceums, instituting temperance lodges and attending temperance conventions. The grand lodge of Good Templars met at Saco, and Mr. Dingley made his report before a large convention. In addition to these labors, he was editor of the Journal and made that paper's influence greater than ever. He was industrious and tireless.


In January, 1868, he took his seat in the state legislature for the fifth time. Again he was tendered the position of speaker, but declined. In the Republican caucus he himself nominated T. C. Woodman of Bucksport, for speaker. In this house were: T. A. D. Fessenden, who was a member of the 37th congress; Thomas B.

Reed, attorney general from 1870 to 1873, member of congress from 1877 to 1899, and speaker of the house in the 51st, 54th, and 55th congresses, and a candidate for president before the national Republican convention at St. Louis in 1896; Eugene Hale, member of the national house in the 42nd, 43rd, 44th and 45th congresses; and United States senator from 1881 to the present time; Harris M. Plaisted, attorney general from 1873 to 1876, member of the lower house in the 44th congress (having been elected to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Samuel F. Hersey in 1875) and elected governor in 1880 as a Greenbacker. Governor Chamberlain outlined the condition of the times when he said in his message to the legislature that "the war has left its wrecks and disorders everywhere. The chief sources of sustenance are cut off. Industries have fallen off. The whole amount of the funded debt of the state is \$5,090,500. The debt at the commencement of the war was \$699,500. The shipbuilding of the state has declined and measures must be taken to revive it." Mr. Dingley was appointed a member of the committees on elections, railroads, federal relations, and education. In this session there was a sharp contest over the repeal of the constabulary law. Dr. Brickett of Augusta, called up the bill to repeal the act establishing a state police. On the 22nd of the month the Republicans, fearing that a majority of the house was inclined to repeal the law, held a conference. Mr. Dingley moved that the Republicans act as a unit and made a vigorous speech in support of his motion, stating that the question was in politics and the Republicans must act. At the state temperance convention which was in session at Augusta, Joshua Nye, state constable, made an address opposing the repeal of the constabulary act. He said the Democrats had misrepresented the act of 1858. This strengthened the hands of the temperance men, and Mr. Dingley introduced a bill in the house explaining the law and putting an end to all opportunity to misrepresent it. But on the 29th of January the repealing bill, after a long and exciting debate, passed the house by a vote of 100 to 33. Mr. Dingley was active in promoting educational matters, and early in the session introduced a bill to establish a state board of education. The bill passed the house by a vote of 84 to 32. Another educational bill which he prepared and introduced and which became a law enlarged the duties of the state superintendent, provided for state and county teachers' institutes and provided for a text-book commission to secure the uniformity of text-books at reduced rates. This law was of permanent benefit to the state.


About this time the whole country was agitated over the impeachment of President Johnson; ¹ and on the 25th of February Mr. Dingley introduced a resolution reciting "that the people of Maine, through their legislature, hereby express their hearty approval of the course of the representatives in congress from this state, in unanimously voting for the impeachment of Andrew Johnson, president of the United States for high crimes and misdemeanors." In support of this resolution Mr. Dingley said that "for two years the person occupying the position of chief magistrate of the nation had made it his first, last and sole purpose to obstruct the reconstruction of the union on a basis of justice and loyalty; to interfere with and oppose the decisions of that branch of the government which under the constitution make laws, before which it is the duty of the executive to bow, and to disturb the peace of the country. For two years, sir, this country has been shaken from center to circumference by the mad ambitions of one man, who, forgetting that his position called him simply to execute the laws and the policy of congress, has set up a policy of his own, and attempted to force it upon the nation. * * * Our forbearance has only stimulated this accidental president to renewed efforts to obstruct the laws, and now we have staring us in the face a clear, unquestioned, bold attempt to set aside a law of the land regulating the occupancy of the war department—an attempt evidently made with a view of securing control of the army for the most dangerous purposes. * * * The facts are patent, and the necessity for this action clear. It is now time to act."

Mr. Bradbury, one of the Democratic leaders spoke against the resolution, saying that the action was a case of indecent haste. Mr. Andrews of Buckfield did likewise. Mr. Hale of Ellsworth said: "I give this resolution God speed." Mr. Walker of Machias spoke against it. Mr. Fessenden of Auburn said that "imperial and despotic power was never vested in President Johnson, and never will be." Mr. Foster of Portland argued for delay. Mr. Webb of Portland said: "All unite and demand that this wicked man, who neither regards the laws of God, nor the rights of man, go not unpunished; demand that he be made powerless to do evil." The resolution was passed under a suspension of the rules by a vote of 92 to 33. Twenty-six were absent.

1—The trial began in the Senate March 23, and lasted nearly two months, attracting the closest attention of the whole country. Johnson was acquitted for lack of a two-thirds majority against him, the vote on the several articles of impeachment standing, guilty 35, not guilty 19. A few Republicans, led by Mr. Fessenden, of Maine, not believing him guilty of an offense warranting his removal from office, voted with the Democrats.



SAMUEL CONY. ISRAEL WASHBURN.
HANNIBAL HAMLIN. SIDNEY PERHAM.



On the 21st of February Mr. Bradbury of Hollis, in the course of a debate charged that General Grant in the first months of the rebellion endeavored to get a situation in the rebel army. Mr. Dingley branded this statement as false, and challenged Mr. Bradbury to prove its truth. Mr. Dingley denied Bradbury's statement that the Democratic party had been the loyal party and had saved the country. He reviewed the plot to break up the union and read Franklin Pierce's letter to Jeff Davis. He also read an extract from a letter written in January, 1861, by Paul S. Merrill, then chairman of the Democratic state committee, incriminating the whole Democratic party. Mr. Dingley closed with these impassioned words: "Loyal indeed! The men who became sad when Union victories in the field were announced and joyful when the rebels triumphed are pretty specimens to talk of loyalty and devotion to the union."

Throughout the session Mr. Dingley assisted in the promotion of temperance, education, loyalty and good morals. He also managed to find time to lecture at Waterville on "The Southern Traveler,"¹ address a large Republican gathering in Lewiston to discuss the impeachment of President Johnson, and to attend the convention of the grand lodge of Good Templars at Bath, over which he presided. At this convention he declined a re-election as grand worthy commander. On the 7th day of March the legislature finally adjourned; and in the closing hour of the house, Mr. Dingley said: "I simply desire to say that I concur entirely in the resolve which is before the house, and in the sentiments which have been expressed by the gentlemen who have preceded me, with reference to the gentleman who has presided over the house during this session. I may say with them that we are greatly indebted to the forbearance and courtesies and skill with which the gentleman who has presided over the house has conducted our business. We came here many of us, as strangers; we shall part, not simply as acquaintances, but as friends. We never shall meet again; but let us carry from here those precious memories, those tender associations which shall always be among the sweet recollections of life."

After the adjournment of the legislature, Mr. Dingley was again urged to be a candidate for congress. Assured of considerable support he started out to make a vigorous canvass. The friends of William P. Frye also brought him forward as a candidate; and the contest between the two gentlemen became very

1—See Appendix.

animated. Mr. Dingley visited every town in the county between May 12th and June 25th, the day of the convention. The race was about even. Mr. Frye carried the Lewiston caucus, Mr. Dingley making no contest. June 6th the county slate footed up: Mr. Dingley, 30 delegates; Mr. Frye, 32 delegates. The district convention met in Auburn. It was a very hot day, and excitement was intense. Mr. Dingley's friends stood by him loyally. The first ballot resulted: Perham 68, Frye 66, Morrill 60, Gilbert 46, Dingley 45. The second ballot was: Frye 72, Perham 64, Morrill 59, Dingley 46, Gilbert 45. The third ballot resulted: Frye 70, Perham 62, Morrill 62, Gilbert 46, Dingley 39. The fourth ballot was: Frye 78, Morrill 64, Perham 53, Gilbert 43, Dingley 38. At this point Mr. Dingley requested that his name be withdrawn. There was no choice on the 5th or 6th ballots; and at the end of the 6th Mr. Perham's name was withdrawn. He had already served three terms in congress, and his withdrawal at this time, received with cheers had a tendency to harmonize the convention. There was no choice on the 7th ballot; but on the 8th ballot Morrill was nominated, receiving 160 votes to 102 for Frye and 14 for Gilbert. It was the most exciting congressional convention held in that district for years; and Mr. Dingley's only comment was: "Everything passed off pleasantly, and the result is acquiesced in by all."

Mr. Dingley emerged from this contest stronger than ever, and entered the campaign for the Republican nominee with more than usual vigor. Governor Chamberlain had been re-nominated for governor by the Republicans, and Eben F. Pillsbury had been re-nominated by the Democrats. Mr. Dingley stumped a portion of the district with S. P. Morrill, who had carried off the congressional nomination, presided at Republican mass meetings, spoke at flag raisings, presided over a Republican mass meeting in Lewiston addressed by Senator Morrill and Ex-Senator Crosswell, took part in several joint political discussions, and wrote vigorous editorials for the Lewiston Journal.

To the surprise of all Dr. Alonzo Garcelon accepted the Democratic nomination for congress in that district, and Mr. Dingley observed: "We cannot believe that Dr. Garcelon has been drawn into political association with Seymour, Pillsbury, V. D. Parris, and Moses McDonald."

On the 14th of September the Republicans carried the state by 19,000 majority. Governor Chamberlain received 75,523 votes, Eben F. Pillsbury 56,207 votes. Five Republican members of congress were elected—Samuel P. Morrill, John A. Peters, James G.

Blaine, Eugene Hale, and John Lynch. This victory paved the way for another Republican victory in November. The national campaign followed quickly on the heels of the state campaign. The Republican ticket, Grant and Colfax, aroused great enthusiasm, and Mr. Dingley said that "the victory in Maine has insured the election of Grant in November. * * * Truly as the certainty of Grant's election manifests itself, the light breaks in every direction." On the night of October 30th there was a long and brilliant torch light procession in Lewiston. The whole city was illuminated from one end to the other, and Mr. Dingley, catching the enthusiasm of the hour, aroused his fellow-citizens to their duty in November. Grant was triumphantly elected and the work of reconstruction resumed. "Grant's election will greatly diminish the crimes in the south, and bring about a condition of peace and security," was Mr. Dingley's comment.

When the state legislature met in January 1869, there was great excitement over the contest between Mr. Morrill and Mr. Hamlin for U. S. senator. Both claimed the prize. Mr. Morrill, who was U. S. senator, was in Washington attending to his duties. Mr. Hamlin was in Augusta. The Republican caucus was held January 7th. Mr. Hamlin received 75 votes, Mr. Morrill 74, and there was one blank. The casting of this blank ballot made all the trouble. The friends of Mr. Hamlin insisted he was fairly nominated, and that any man who failed to vote for him would be called a bolter and disorganizer. They published the card of the member who cast the blank vote in which he said he intended to vote for neither candidate. Mr. Morrill's friends insisted that Mr. Hamlin did not have a clear majority and the caucus adjourned with the ruling of the chair that no nomination had been made. It was claimed that every Republican member was at liberty to do as he pleased. Mr. Hamlin, however, was nominated, amid intense excitement.

From September 1868 to September 1872, Mr. Dingley led an active and varied life. His newspaper, the *Lewiston Journal*, was increasing in circulation and influence. It was a business success and an object of pride to him who had watched it and nursed it since 1856. The *Journal* was always uncompromisingly Republican—a political guide to the Republicans of Maine. It was to Maine Republicans what the *New York Tribune* was to the Republicans at large.

Mr. Dingley attended and addressed state and national temperance conventions, Congregational conventions and political

conventions. The latter part of May he went to Oswego, N. Y., to attend the national convention of Good Templars. June 24th he attended the Republican state convention at Bangor, when Governor Chamberlain was renominated. Mr. Dingley, however, supported Sidney Perham. Early in August he attended the state editorial convention at Portland and delivered a public address at city hall. In September he went to California in search of rest and recreation, returning only to be seriously ill and reduced in weight to 123 pounds. December 17th Horace Greeley lectured in Lewiston and Mr. Dingley presided.

In the winter of 1870 he went to Augusta, attended the Republican caucus and appeared before legislative committees in behalf of important railroad and educational measures. He advocated the granting of a charter for a railroad from Lewiston to Rumford; also a bill in favor of uniformity of text-books.

The Republican state convention was held June 15th 1870. Sidney Perham ¹ was nominated for governor. Mr. Dingley, who was one of Mr. Perham's warm supporters, ² presided over this convention, and in the course of his address said that "recent history, brief as it may be in years, covers a series of events such as only centuries ordinarily produce, and which must immortalize that organization to which was committed the responsibility. * * * But there are still rights to be defended; there are principles of justice to be asserted." It was fitting for Mr. Dingley to preside over a convention that nominated Sidney Perham for governor, for Mr. Dingley and Mr. Perham had for years been co-laborers in the cause of temperance and good government. ³

June 29th, William P. Frye, was nominated for congress by the Republicans of that district. Mr. Dingley said: "Mr. Frye will

1—S. F. Hersey, Hannibal Hamlin's candidate for governor, was opposed to Mr. Perham. The latter says: "I owe my nomination in this convention largely to the untiring efforts of Mr. Dingley."

2—"It always seemed strange to me," says Gov. Perham, "that Mr. Dingley, so eminently qualified for this place, and evidently having in mind his own selection for governor, chose to step aside at this time and help secure my nomination. Doubtless for some reason he felt it was not his time."

3—Governor Perham said in 1900: "Nelson Dingley started the movement in my favor, and his influence proved to be a power. The convention was in Augusta, and there were 1,400 delegates in the hall. The contest was an exciting one, and I won by 40 votes. In many respects Nelson Dingley was the ablest public man Maine has ever produced. He was not an orator or a great debater, but in general information and judgment he had a wonderful mind. His memory was remarkably retentive, and his grasp on all the details of public affairs astonished all with whom he came in contact. His work was creative, and is being shown in the prosperity of the country today. He will live in history as one of the greatest men the country has ever produced."

enter congress prepared by his large legislative experience, by his familiarity with parliamentary proceedings, by his ability and eloquence as a public speaker, and by his practical wants of the district, to at once take a high position in the national house." The state campaign was very uninteresting. The Republicans were apathetic. There were few speeches and little excitement. Mr. Dingley spent the summer attending the Main Congregational conference at Yarmouth, the editorial convention at Rye Beach, and resting at his summer home at the sea shore. The Republicans carried the state by about 8,000 majority. Sidney Perham received 54,019 votes, and Chas. W. Roberts, the Democratic candidate for governor, 45,733 votes. Five Republican members of congress were elected—John Lynch, William Frye, James G. Blaine, John Peters, and Eugene Hale.

The winter of 1870-1871 found Mr. Dingley laboring industriously on the Journal and in the lecture field. His most popular lecture was on "The Mormons." ¹ He secured material for this lecture when in California the summer before.

April 20, 1871, was Fast Day in the State of Maine, and public services were held at the Pine street Congregational church, Lewiston. Alonzo Garcelon was mayor of the city; and public sentiment was somewhat aroused over what was claimed to be a failure to enforce the liquor law. In the course of the exercises, Rev. Mr. Boothby prayed that "the mayor might have help on High to enable him to discharge his duties." Mayor Garcelon was in the audience, and took exceptions to the prayer of Rev. Mr. Boothby. Rising from his seat and going to the front of the church he turned and addressed the large audience saying: "A lie will travel a league while truth is putting on its boots. I suppose from the remarks of the reverend gentleman that hell itself has broken loose in our city and that the waters of the river have changed to rum. I have been foully libeled in this prayer to Almighty God. I wish to state that all my appointments have been with a view of enforcing the law. It is as much the duty of every citizen, and of this reverend libeler, and of the editor of the Journal to execute this law as it is of the public police force. It is a foul bird that soils its own nest. The base libel put fourth in the prayer, and the misrepresentations published in the Journal, reflect upon the character of our reputable city."

The editor of the Journal was present in the audience when Mayor Garcelon made this speech. The next day the Journal con-

1—See Appendix.

tained a long and vigorous reply setting forth a large amount of good sense and a larger amount of law. It completely answered the statement of Mayor Garcelon, sustained the reverend gentleman who earnestly invoked Almighty God, and aroused public sentiment so that the liquor laws were strictly enforced thereafter.

The latter part of May Mr. Dingley was in Washington and attended a large reception at the White House given by President Grant. In an interesting letter to the Journal describing this reception and the appearance of Mrs. Grant and Nellie, Mr. Dingley said that "the President bore the ceremonies like a martyr." He spent the summer at his island home, and early in September entered the state campaign. He spoke at several large rallies and materially assisted the Republicans in the election of their state ticket. Sidney Perham was re-elected governor by about 10,000 majority.

During these years Mr. Dingley's domestic life was singularly happy. He was fond of his children and gave to them that love and devotion which only a fond parent can bestow. His first sorrow came on the 6th of December, 1862, when his little son, Charlie, passed away at the age of two and a half years. Mr. Dingley's diary, for years after, contained loving recollections of his "dear boy" who had passed on to a better land. For almost ten years after this first visitation of death in his family, there was nothing to bring sorrow into the household. But early in December, 1871, the grim messenger again appeared at the family altar; and on the 2nd day of that month, his mother—"dearest mother" as he was wont to call her—whom he revered and loved with a tenderness that only a lofty and noble character can display, passed away. To her, of whom he wrote so beautifully in earlier years, Mr. Dingley paid a beautiful tribute in the columns of the Journal. ¹ "Asleep in Jesus," and "Jesus Lover of My Soul," were sung, the latter at Mr. Dingley's special request, as it was his favorite hymn. And it is interesting, yes pathetic, to note that at the request of Congressman Dingley's family, this same beautiful hymn was sung at his own funeral, 28 years later, in the national house of representatives at Washington; for it was his favorite hymn.

Mr. Dingley's most important public work in the winter of 1871-72 was the securing of a charter for the Grand Trunk railroad from Lewiston to Danville Junction. He fought for the bill before the legislative committee and the legislature itself. Frederick

1—See Appendix.

Robie, afterwards governor of the state was speaker.¹ There was great excitement and intense feeling aroused by the opposition of a few, interested in the Maine Central railroad. Public meetings were held, addressed by Mr. Dingley and others. The question was whether Lewiston and Auburn should subscribe to stock in the Lewiston and Auburn railroad, which road was to be leased to the Grand Trunk railroad. Most of the opposition came from the owners of the local mills, residing in the city of Boston. As a result of this exciting episode, on the 9th day of April Lewiston voted by an overwhelming majority to take stock in the railroad. Auburn followed on the next day, and there was great rejoicing.

From January to April, Mr. Dingley was also active in temperance matters, addressing several conventions and gatherings in different parts of the state.

The important political events of the spring and summer were the nomination of Horace Greeley for president, by the Liberals, and later by the Democrats, and the renomination of President Grant by the Republicans at large, and the renomination of Governor Perham by the Republicans of Maine. The Cincinnati Liberal convention "attracted hangers-on so long as they could keep their hands in the fleshpots," said Mr. Dingley. Greeley's position was the result of a resentment on account of President Grant's failure to give the friends of the philosopher as large a slice of the national offices as the editor thought due him. But Mr. Dingley was disposed to be fair to Mr. Greeley, by saying that "it is a disgrace that many of the leading men in the Republican party whom Greeley elevated to influence, have been so ready to turn their backs on their benefactor. But then politicians are generally ungrateful."

The national platform of this year was "one in which Republicans can take honorable pride. It declares for protection, the extension of American commerce and ship-building interests. The cry of the opposition is, anything to beat Grant." In referring to the Democratic convention which nominated Greeley, Mr. Dingley called it "the Baltimore wedding," and said it was not a marriage of affection but one of supposed self-interest. A Grant and Wilson club was organized in Lewiston and Mr. Dingley was elected president. On the occasion of its organization, both Mr. Blaine and Mr. Morrill spoke. The campaign was very exciting, and Mr. Dingley

1—Former Gov. Robie said in 1900: "For Nelson Dingley I entertained the most profound regard. I was always acquainted with him, and we were always close friends personal and political. He helped me to the first speakership in 1873 and the other also in 1876, for that matter. On both of these occasions I received the unanimous support of Androscoggin county, and it was largely through Mr. Dingley's influence. He was a great man and a great power."

took an important part. On the 26th of July he made a speech in Lewiston in reply to General Kilpatrick, in which he said that "the question is, ought Republicans to assist in the movement to overthrow the Republican party and to restore the Democracy to the power they wielded in 1860?" In this speech he said that the Republicans were urged to vote for Greeley because Grant's administration was corrupt and extravagant. Mr. Dingley showed by facts that it was one of the most economical and upright that the country had ever had. He also spoke at other points in the state, and on the 6th of September was himself nominated for representative to the state legislature. On the 7th of September there was a great torchlight parade—the largest demonstration Lewiston had seen for years. It was the close of the state campaign and the whole country had its eyes fixed on the state of Maine. Every school district in the state had been canvassed; and when on the night of September 9th the votes were counted, it was found that the Republicans had swept the state. Governor Perham received 71,888 votes and Chas. B. Kimball, the Democratic candidate for governor, 55,343 votes. Mr. Dingley was elected by the largest majority he ever received as a candidate for representative in the state legislature. He called it "Maine's Tidal Wave," and said that "its influence will be decisive in all parts of the country. There will be a general stampede to Grant." Mr. Blaine telegraphed Grant: "Our victory is complete and overwhelming at all points, and insures you more than 25,000 majority in November."

That fall Mr. Dingley addressed temperance conventions, educational conventions, and farmers' associations.

On the 8th of November President Grant was re-elected amid great rejoicing. Mr. Dingley observed: "It is a strange situation—Greeley, the great Republican leader endorsed by Sumner, Trumbull, Schurz, Banks—all going to defeat. The reason is only personal for their course. There is not a single principle to justify their action. The probability is that before Grant's second term expires, the south will settle down into a thorough acceptance of the results of the war, and the colored men will be recognized then as citizens having equal rights. The influence in financial directions is good. The nation's policy is settled. The result is a vindication of Grant's character and motives." Maine gave Grant 30,000 majority, 5,000 more than Mr. Blaine predicted.

January 1, 1873, Mr. Dingley took his seat in the state legislature for the sixth and last time. Edmund F. Webb of Waterville was elected speaker, and Mr. Dingley was appointed chairman of

the committee on education and a member of the committee on judiciary. He was, in this session, as in the last, the recognized leader of his party in the house. Associated with him were: Ara Cushman, the well known shoe manufacturer of Auburn; Weston F. Milliken, a prominent Republican of Portland; W. W. Thomas, Jr., later U. S. minister to Sweden; D. N. Mortland, afterwards state railroad commissioner; and James R. Talbot of Machias.

Governor Perham reviewed the situation of the country in his message to the legislature. He said that the recent presidential election indicated great unanimity upon the leading questions of public policy. The debt of the state Jan. 1, 1873, was \$7,187,900. He referred to the educational development of the state and her great resources. Concerning the enforcement of the prohibitory laws he said: "It is probable that less intoxicating liquors are drank in Maine than in any other place of equal population in the country, perhaps the civilized world."

The second day of the session Mr. Dingley offered a bill to authorize the formation of railroad companies. This was called the free railroad bill which passed the house but was defeated in the senate. This bill authorized twenty-five or more persons to organize as a railroad company the same as if specially chartered. He also framed and championed a free high school bill and a bill to promote the efficiency of the public schools of Maine, both of which became laws.¹ He also reported a bill putting normal schools under the direction of a board of seven trustees.

On the 27th of February the legislature adjourned, and in his parting message to his fellow members and to the hall in which he had spent so many days promoting the interests of the state, he said: "This session has to me at least, been one of unusual interest, and in separating I am sure that not only myself, but every member of this house will carry with him the remembrance of the associations which have been vouchsafed to us during the past two months. I am sure, too, that the proceedings of this legislature have been such as to commend themselves to the judgment of the people of the state. If we have erred at all, it has been on the side of caution. * * * I am sure that in some of the legislation, there have been enacted measures which will tell wonderfully upon the future of this state. * * * It has been my fortune to have been a member of some half a dozen previous legislatures, and I

1—Chapter 115, acts of 1873. "An act to enable academies to surrender their property to cities, towns or plantations for the benefit of free high schools."

Chapter 124, acts of 1873. "Towns may establish and maintain free high schools and may receive state aid not exceeding \$500.00 to any one town."

can say from my heart that no previous session has seemed to me to be so harmonious, and to embody so much that we shall carry away and always hold in fond remembrance. We came here most of us strangers—we part friends. * * * We shall never all meet again on earth; but I trust that when our life-work is done, and when we shall cross the dark river, it will be our unspeakable happiness to be gathered in that distant land—that haven prepared for those who have faithfully done their duties." Thus closed his legislative career in the state house of representatives.

In addition to his editorial and legislative labors, Mr. Dingley delivered his lecture on "The Mormons" at Auburn, Augusta, West Waterville, Bath, Pittsfield, Biddeford, Fryeburg and Harrison. He was now 41 years old. He had served in the house six terms, twice as speaker. He displayed a wonderful grasp of parliamentary and legislative questions, and gave evidence of his future greatness. His judgment in business and political affairs was unerring, and his executive ability was exceptional. He possessed a mind stored with facts covering a wide range. His memory was wonderful. His powers of reasoning were rare. He was considerate and gentle, yet firm and decisive. He was honest, and the people had faith in him. He was a christian and the people revered him. It might be truthfully said, he was directed by an unseen hand to great and good deeds. Not even a shadow of scandal rested upon him. Like Caesar's wife he was above suspicion. ¹

1—Hon. S. J. Chadbourn, writes as follows of Mr. Dingley as a legislator: "He was a member of the house in 1873, and I was the clerk. As a legislator he was industrious, methodical and painstaking, thus early giving promise of the great ability with which he distinguished himself, later, when a member of the national house of representatives. During his service in the Maine house, he was ever found on the right or moral side of all important public measures. Mr. Dingley as is well known, was always a persistent, consistent, active temperance man and worker, and he gave, while in the public service of the state, an impetus to the cause of prohibition that placed it on high ground above the assaults of its enemies. He stood for liberty, humanity, and progress, which were the tenets of his party."

CHAPTER VIII.

1873-1876.


During the winter of 1872-1873 Mr. Dingley's name was freely used by many of his friends in connection with the Republican nomination for governor; but he did not think seriously of the matter until the close of the session of the legislature. April 17 (Fast day) he went to Brunswick to address a temperance reform club. There he met by appointment, Governor Perham, Col. Fred N. Dow, Col. Shaw, Hon. E. W. Stetson and other friends, and decided to allow the use of his name in connection with the gubernatorial nomination. On the 23rd of April he met General Murray, Col. Drew, Mr. Stacey, Congressman Blaine and others in Augusta; and the information he obtained led him to arrange at once to publicly announce his candidacy. He made no canvass but simply wrote letters to friends in every county in the state. Having decided to be a candidate for governor he published the following in the Journal: "From the relations to the Journal of one of the gentlemen mentioned in connection with this nomination, it will not be expected of us that we should say more than simply to quote the views of some of our Republican contemporaries."

Nearly all the Republican papers in the state favored his candidacy—the Farmington Chronicle leading off. The Chronicle said: "He is the strongest man in every desirable sense of the word, that the Republican party of this state can put in nomination." The Oxford Democrat said: "A more worthy, competent and suitable man to fill the place, could not be brought forward than Mr. Dingley, and he only consents to be a candidate at the request of leading men throughout the state." The Machias Republican said: "Mr.


Dingley is no trading politician, but an honest, candid, straightforward man." The Bridgton News said: "He is able and thoroughly conversant with the affairs of the state, of strict integrity, and in every respect such a man as the public can take pleasure in elevating to positions of honor and trust." The Portland Star said: "He is a man of the people, and his name is identified with many of the reforms in which the public have taken most interest." The Saco Independent said: "He is a man of high character, noble purpose and indomitable will." The Calias Advertiser said: "He is a man of the people and not a politician. A man of integrity and purity of personal and political character."

On the 13th of May, Hon. N. A. Farwell, who was also a candidate for governor, withdrew, and declared for Ex-Judge Kent of Bangor. There was great excitement during the latter part of the canvass, but Mr. Dingley found time to deliver the Memorial day address at Bethel. The caucus to select delegates to the state convention from the city of Lewiston, was held June 7th. Through secret efforts, largely by a few Republicans who objected to his activity in securing a charter for the Lewiston and Auburn railroad (leased to the Grand Trunk railroad), a few delegates opposed to him were placed upon the delegation. There was much feeling upon the part of Mr. Dingley's friends, but the incident was passed by unnoticed by him who was most deeply interested.

The convention met in the city of Bangor, June 19th. Congressman Hale presided, and Congressman Wm. P. Frye headed the delegation from Lewiston. There were 1,246 delegates, and in addition a large number of friends of each of the candidates. Mr. Dingley's headquarter's were at the Bangor house. They were thronged with his friends and supporters, all confident of his nomination, notwithstanding the slight defection in his own delegation. The convention met at eleven in the morning and the balloting began at three o'clock in the afternoon. At Mr. Dingley's suggestion, the convention voted to ballot by counties. This was done in order to bring squarely before the convention whatever defection existed in Lewiston. The plan worked successfully, and when Androscoggin county was called, the vote in that county stood—Dingley 68, Stone 5, Kent 2. Thus the opposition to him in his own county, small as it was, was exposed. The first ballot resulted as follows: Dingley 816, Stone 211, Kent 170. The announcement was received with intense enthusiasm; and in the midst of long and enthusiastic applause, the candidate was called for and escorted to the platform. In accepting the nomination he said:



NELSON DINGLEY JR.—1874-5.
GOVERNOR OF MAINE.



"For the distinguished mark of confidence which as I am informed by your committee this convention has conferred upon me, I tender you my most sincere thanks. I accept the nomination with which you have honored me, with a due appreciation of the regard it implies, and, as I trust, with a deep sense of the obligations and responsibilities which it may impose. * * * I most earnestly join with you in condemnation of such flagrant disregard of the obligations of public faith and virtue as was some months since shown by the officials of the chief commercial city of the union and more recently in a less extensive, but not less dangerous manner, by such members of congress as accepted an interest in Credit Mobilier stock or dividend, after they had reason to suppose that it was intended to influence their votes for legislation favoring the corporations at the expense of the nation. I most heartily approve of the earnest and unequivocal manner in which you have rebuked the action of the late congress on the salary measure and demanding its prompt repeal. This measure I cannot but regard as wrong in principle, and dangerous in practice and involving such a breach of faith as would make it a pernicious precedent and an evil example, should it not be repealed. It is with me a deep and abiding conviction that national safety is to be assured only by the preservation of public virtue and integrity, and that the secret of compactness is in national conscience, national affection, and national faith in moral ideas."

The platform adopted denounced the recent action of congress known as the salary grab, deplored the increase of private legislation both in the legislatures of the state and in the national congress, and finally declared, "that this convention presents to the people the Hon. Nelson Dingley Jr. as a gentleman of unspotted reputation, distinguished for his services in the public affairs of the state, and capable of filling the executive chair with the wisdom and ability demanded by the first office in the state."

That night Lewiston indulged in a rousing celebration over Mr. Dingley's nomination, and the next day he was received royally by his fellow townsmen. In commenting upon Mr. Dingley's nomination, the Journal said with characteristic modesty: "To say nothing of the candidate selected, the other gentlemen were of so high character and so unexceptional and conceded ability, that there was a feeling of regret among most Republicans that they were obliged to select one and set aside others."

More than three-quarters of the Democratic papers spoke in words of strong approval of Mr. Dingley's speech of acceptance.

There was no political canvass during the summer on either side, Mr. Dingley's election being conceded. There was little interest in the campaign. The Democrats nominated Joseph Titcomb of Kennebunk as their candidate for governor. Even the Democratic papers of the state spoke very kindly of Mr. Dingley's candidacy, so highly was he esteemed by men of all parties. The liberal Democrats nominated Joseph H. Williams for governor, but he cut very little figure in the election. The contest resulted in Mr. Dingley's election for governor by a majority of 9,535 over all. He received 45,244 votes, Titcomb 32,924, Williams 2,160, scattering 625. On the 30th of December he held a conference with Mr. Blaine at the latter's home in Augusta, and on the 8th of January he was inaugurated governor. The state capitol was crowded on that day. One of the Republican leaders and one of Maine's favorite sons was to assume the responsibilities attending the position of chief executive of the state. His record as a temperance man and an advocate of moral legislation had made him famous throughout the state; and his inaugural address attracted wide attention. Among other things he said: "In entering upon the discharge of the duties to which we have been respectively called by our fellow-citizens, it is fitting that we should recognize our dependence upon that Being who is over all and above all. We have cause for devout gratitude for the Divine favor which has been shown toward the state and the nation during the year which has just closed. In no period of the history of either, has our advance in population, material prosperity and other conditions, been more conspicuous. We may well congratulate ourselves that so marked progress has been made in healing the wounds of the terrible struggle for national existence and in re-uniting all sections of our beloved country in a common devotion to a republic preserved from the enemies without and within, redeemed from the curse of slavery and consecrated to the grand work of maintaining the equal rights of every citizen. The financial panic which so recently threatened to cause serious derangement to the business of the country, has not been without its influence for good. It has given new emphasis to the great economic law, that the savings rather than the incomes of the people are the measure of their material prosperity. The careful observer of the tendencies to extravagance so noticeable everywhere, cannot but recognize the truth that economy is the one word that needs to be spoken and put in practice in private as well as public circles. Fortunately the wave of extravagance has not been felt in this part of the country with as much force as elsewhere.

Although the public affairs of the state have been managed with such exceptional prudence and integrity, that the opportunities for retrenchment are few; yet you will undoubtedly consider it an imperative duty at this time to study the closest economy and to confine your appropriations within as narrow limits as is consistent with the public welfare. In wisely prescribing the extent of public expenditures, and in determining such cases of compensation of public officers as may arise, you cannot fail to recognize those rules which are at once the safety and glory of a popular government—that frugality and simplicity are essential characteristics of free institutions; and that official position should be sought less for the salaries attached to them than for the satisfaction and honor which comes from faithful public service. In every endeavor to maintain and promote the highest efficiency, economy and integrity in all the departments of the state government, you will have my earnest co-operation. * * * It will be observed that up to the present time almost the only resource of the state to meet both ordinary and extraordinary expenditures, has been direct taxation. The state tax last year was five mills on the dollar, but it is the judgment of the treasurer that the tax may be reduced the present year to 4 1-2 mills providing the legislature shall make no unusual appropriations. I most earnestly urge, however, that you should consider whether it is not advisable to devise some method other than direct taxation to secure a part of the revenue required for state expenditures; so that the rate of taxation may be still further reduced. Pennsylvania finds no difficulty in securing sufficient receipts from indirect taxation to support the state government. A large share of the state expenditures of Massachusetts is met by the proceeds of a state tax upon the valuation of the corporate stock of railroads and other corporations over and above municipal taxation for real estate and machinery; and upon the business of the fire and life insurance companies. Without indicating more in detail what sources of revenue may be made available in this state, I desire to call your attention to the subject, and to suggest a careful investigation and inquiry, with a view of devising methods of lifting some portion of the burden of taxation from real estate. Such a policy would give needed encouragement to our agricultural interests and promote the developments of the resources of the state. * * * The report of the superintendent of common schools presents an encouraging view of the conditions and prospects of the educational interests of the state. The increase in school money arising from the state mill tax and the tax on savings banks; the improvements in

methods of teaching growing largely out of the work of our normal schools; and the already marked influence of the free high school system adopted by the last legislature, have materially improved the character and efficiency of our public schools and aroused a new interest in the cause of education. The free high school system, although in practical operation but little more than half of the year, has already achieved so great a success as to surpass the utmost expectations of its warmest friends and to promise within a reasonable time, results that but satisfy all of the wisdom of the policy. The official reports show that 150 free high schools, in 133 different towns and plantations, representing every county in the state, have been maintained from one to three terms each, since the first of March last; and that these schools have been supported by municipal appropriations to the amount of \$83,523, and state aid to the amount of \$28,134. In these schools 10,286 pupils have received instructions in those branches usually taught in the common schools, including primary studies; and also in such other directions as are demanded by the increasing industrial and business wants of the time. * * * Many youths who will hereafter make valuable teachers of our common schools are receiving in the free high schools that broader and deeper culture so essential to prepare them for this high work. * * * It was feared by some that the system would be impractical for small towns; but some of the most successful free high schools maintained during the autumn have been in just such localities. * * * Indeed, thus far the most complete success of the free high school system has been in exclusively farming towns where this adjunct of the common school system is affording such facilities of education as can serve to increase the attraction of that rural life which is the source of our national strength and purity. With a continuance of the system there can scarcely be a doubt that within a brief period these schools will be established in most all the towns of the state; and will give such an impetus to our educational interests as nothing else could.

"It is cheaper and more effective and beneficent to prevent crime by removing its causes, than to allow these to ripen into criminal acts which require punishment. A large part of this work of prevention is within the sphere of personal moral effort; yet that important portion which consists in removing the hindrances to right conduct, and repressing the temptation to vice interposed by men in their relations as citizens, comes confessedly within the domain of the law. Indeed no government fulfills its mission which forgets that the state can in this way do much to make it easy to do

right and difficult to do wrong. So large a proportion of pauperism and crime arises from intemperance of which the dram shop is the prolific cause, that all citizens who have regard for the public safety and welfare, as well as the highest court of the nation, unite in affirming the principle that the liquor traffic is a source of great peril to society, against which it is the duty of the state to protect itself by such enactments as the legislative authority shall consider best calculated to that end. On this well settled principle has rested all the legislation ever had in restraint of the liquor traffic, whether involving the principle of license or prohibition. For more than 200 years, first in the parent province and commonwealth and subsequently in the state of Maine, a thorough trial was had of the license system in every form that could be devised. This experience led to so wide-spread conviction that any system of licensing dram shops is nearly powerless to repress the temptations which promote intemperance, that in 1851 this state adopted the policy of prohibiting drinking houses, and tippling shoppes altogether, and of authorizing the sale of intoxicating liquors only for medicinal and mechanical purposes, by agents appointed for that purpose. This system has had a trial of only 22 years; yet its success in this brief period has on the whole been so much greater than that of any other plan yet devised, that prohibition may be said to be accepted by a large majority of the people as the proper policy of this state toward drinking houses and tippling shops, and to be acquiesced in to a great extent by others, as an experiment which should have as thorough a trial as other systems which preceded it. By dealing in this spirit with a question affecting so momentous interests, there will ultimately be substantial agreement among all good citizens on such a policy as experience shall have shown to be the most effective in repressing the evils of the liquor traffic. To this end such an investigation into the effects of the traffic, and the results of the legislation to suppress or restrain the same, as is contemplated by a proposition introduced into congress by one of the representatives from this state, could not fail to be in the highest degree beneficial. It would be unwise for anyone to claim that prohibition has entirely suppressed or can entirely suppress the dram shop. That is no more possible than it is for human enactments to entirely prevent theft, robbery, arson, or even murder. Indeed, any effective enactments against practices which are exceptionally profitable, and at the same time pander to mens' appetites and passions, are peculiarly difficult of thorough enactment as has already been found the case with statutes prohibiting gambling saloons, as well as drink-

ing houses and tippling shops. The true test of the merits of such legislation of whatever character, is not whether it entirely uproots the evils prohibited, but whether on the whole it does not repress them as effectually as any system that can be devised. Where our prohibitory laws have been well enforced, few will deny that they have accomplished great good. In more than three-fourths of the state, especially in rural portions, where forty years since intoxicating liquors were as freely and commonly used as any article of merchandise, public sentiment has secured such an enforcement of these laws that there is now in these districts few open bars; and even secret sales are so much reduced as to make drunkenness in rural towns comparatively rare. The exceptions to this state of things are mainly in some of the cities and larger villages, where public sentiment on this question is usually not so sustained as in towns more remote from the tide of immigration. But even in these places our prohibitory legislation has always been enforced to some extent, and not infrequently with much thoroughness; and has never been without that important influence for good which all laws in moral directions exert. * * * Valuable and indispensable as is the prohibitory system of legislation for the repression of drinking houses and tippling shops, whose fruits are drunkenness, ignorance, brutality, waste, pauperism, crime, impaired health, shattered intellect, premature decay and untimely death, it should not be forgotten that the efficiency of law, as well as the power of those moral instrumentalities which law only supplements, depend upon the constancy and energy with which labors are directed to maintain a high standard of public sentiment on this question. In so glorious a moral work as this, every good citizen should unite his sympathies and efforts. * * * Our obligations to the men who took their lives in their hands and went forth to the call of their country, will not be redeemed so long as there shall remain a destitute boy in blue or an indigent family of a living or dead soldier whose necessities are not supplied, and supplied, too, not as paupers, but as citizens, who are only receiving what they have more than earned. * * * In view of the fact that the 30th day of May each year has been designated by the Grand Army of the Republic as the soldiers memorial day, there seems to me to be eminent propriety in giving the same legal recognition to the day in this state as is given to other holidays. * * * I suggest whether it would not be more in accord with the dignity of the state and the independence of the office of railroad commissioner, if the salaries of the commissioners should be paid from the state treas-

ury and the state itself should assess the several railroad corporations for the amount of the same. Railroads have become so indispensable an agency in the material development of the state and exert so important an influence over the public interests, as to make the laws relating to them worthy of your thoughtful attention.

"The pressing necessity for the extension of new railroads into large sections of our state, have thus far made restrictions on railroad corporations in the public interest, seem to be less essential than in many other states. The fact that such a feeling of confidence exists to a great extent, makes the present time peculiarly favorable for such a careful revision of our railroad legislation, as will, on the one hand, impose upon railroad corporations just responsibilities and restraints, and on the other hand, properly protect capital and inspire that public confidence which is so essential to the true interests of railroads as well as communities. Inasmuch as railroad corporations are granted extraordinary powers which partake of the nature of sovereignty, it is only after many limitations and restrictions that they can be said to be private corporations at all. Railroads should not and cannot be regarded simply or even principally as the property of individuals to be managed as they please. They are public works, no matter by whose capital built; and while the rights of the property in them may not be violated, yet it is the right and duty of the state to see to it that they are so managed as to serve the public. So superior are they to every other means of land transportation, and so expensive is the construction of competing lines, that railroads are practically and not necessarily in any offensive sense, monopolies along their respective lines of business; and unless there is some power to restrain them expressly or impliedly reserved, in the control of the state, as there always is in other grants of exclusive privileges, they may not only impose such freight and passenger tax on the people as to control markets and destroy or build up communities, but they may discriminate between citizens at pleasure. Valuable and even indispensable as railroads may be to a community so long as these corporations are servants, yet, in view of the tendency to a combination of their interests and aggregation of their capital in the hands of a few, if they are allowed to become masters, a large part of the benefits which the public have a right to expect from them, will be lost and the corporations become sources of oppression and public peril. * * * The question as to how far the legislature may exercise control of the railroad corporations which it has hitherto chartered—the most of them with peculiar privileges

and powers—is still in some important aspects an open one, although judicial decisions are gradually developing legislative rights which these corporations have steadily denied. It has been held by the supreme court of the United States that railroad corporations are common carriers, as that office is defined by the common law—at least as far as to require them to provide sufficient and convenient methods of transportation and to carry passengers and freight for all persons without distinction and without unjust discriminations; even if not on such terms as may be determined to be reasonable. It has also been held that a railroad corporation may be judicially deprived of its franchises for non-use or misuse of them; and that notwithstanding the ownership of a railroad may be private, yet the use is public, and the road itself a public highway. And as a necessary consequence of this the court added by way of argument that ‘the legislature is the executive judge of the mode of use,’ and this carries with it the right to make such provisions and impose such restrictions as the legislature may think necessary for public convenience as well as safety. * * *

I recommend a general law for the formation of railroad corporations and construction of railroads. Hitherto this has been done by special charter and has involved not only all the evils incident to all special ordinary legislation, but also, at least in some other states, in cases where proposed railroads are supposed to conflict with existing railways, those fearfully demoralizing practices to which great corporations sometimes resort to defeat or promote legislative measures. These evils would be entirely removed by a general law authorizing a suitable number of persons, under restrictions which carefully protected private as well as public interests, to construct railroads between such points as they desire and could obtain the means to build. * * *

Inasmuch as it must ever be the aim of the managers of a railroad corporation to make the net earnings sufficient to pay the interest on the bounded indebtedness and stock of the road, the law should guard against the serious evils which have resulted in some states from what is popularly known as ‘watering stock’ by absolutely prohibiting the issuing of any stock except for a consideration of money, labor or property equal to the par value of such stock; or any bonds or other evidence of indebtedness except for such consideration equal to perhaps 80 per cent of their value. * * *

So much danger is incident to the growing practice of railroad corporations in purchasing and holding real and personal property for other purposes than those necessary to carry on the business for

which they are incorporated, that it may be well to consider whether all such transactions should not be clearly forbidden by law. * * * You will rejoice with me that Maine has entered upon a career of marked prosperity. We have been ready, perhaps too ready, to conceive that Maine is not a good agricultural state, yet with all its drawbacks of climate and soil, it is capable of demonstrating that the farmers in those sections of our state where manufacturing and industrial operations have developed home markets, are as prosperous as those of states which have a more genial climate, and a more fertile soil but are further removed from the consumer. * * * It is such a development of our natural resources as will create home markets, that those engaged in agricultural pursuits must look for a permanent promotion of their interests. * * * In this great work as well as in every measure calculated to promote the material and moral interests of our beloved state I shall take pleasure in earnestly co-operating. Invoking the favor and guidance of that kind Providence who is over states and nations as well as individuals, may we severally consecrate ourselves to the work before us."

This message was received with almost universal approval. It was deemed a non partisan document commending itself to every good citizen. The following constituted Governor Dingley's executive council: E. C. Spring, Jonathan Fogg, F. A. Chase, A. B. Shaw, A. R. Reed, E. Hanson, and L. L. Lowell.

In accordance with the governor's recommendation, Hon. A. W. Paine of Bangor, formerly insurance commissioner, was appointed to inquire into the tax system of Massachusetts and other states, with a view to devising resources other than direct taxation, to meet state expenditures. Governor Dingley wrote that "it is estimated there are more than 20 out of the 30 or 40 millions of railroad property in Maine not taxed a cent for any purpose." He was also in favor of taxing foreign insurance companies, believing that they should contribute to the revenue of the state. As a result of the agitation relative to the taxation of railroads and other corporations, about the middle of February agents of railroad and insurance companies appeared to oppose all such legislation. They hired able lobbyists and employed every means to defeat the plan proposed and inaugurated by Governor Dingley. But success crowned his efforts, and a law was enacted providing for the taxation of railroads, based upon their capital stock, the par value of their shares and the length of their lines. Such railroads were to pay annually into the state treasury a tax of one and one-half per cent upon their

corporate franchises. This act was approved March 4, 1874, and together with amendments made in 1880 and 1881, is substantially the railroad law today relative to the taxation of railroads. A bill was also passed taxing foreign insurance companies; and the principle incorporated in the law is on the statute books today. Another law resulting from the Governor's efforts was one providing that railroads should make annual reports to the county commissioners, giving their receipts, indebtedness, etc. Concerning this new railroad legislation, the Governor said: "In April the railroads are to be taxed one and one-half per cent on their market value as ascertained by multiplying their number of shares by the market price per share, and deducting therefrom the valuation of real estate of the road taxed by municipalities." The general railroad incorporation bill and the railroad connection bill, were defeated by the lobby.

The railroads of the state resisted the payment of this tax. The Maine Central and the Grand Trunk appealed to the courts. The courts however sustained the law and the principle inaugurated by Governor Dingley was upheld. These cases can be found in the Maine reports—*State of Maine vs. Maine Central* 66 Maine, 488,¹ and *State of Maine vs. Maine Central Railroad*, 74 Maine, 382.² General Henry B. Cleaves was attorney general of the state when the suit was commenced against the Grand Trunk for the state tax of 1880 and 1881. The suit went through the courts of the United States and was finally argued before the supreme court by Hon. Charles E. Littlefield, attorney general of the state, and decided in favor of the state in the winter of 1891-2. It is thus interesting to note that this important principle of taxing railroads originally on values, later on gross earnings, inaugurated by Governor Dingley in the state of Maine, was finally settled in the United States supreme court by Hon. Charles E. Littlefield, Governor Dingley's successor in congress.

Governor Dingley found time outside of his official duties to make an address at the dedication of the Hollowell classical insti-

1—66 Maine 488—An action of debt to recover of the defendant corporation, a tax duly assessed upon its corporate franchise in accordance with chapter 358 of the laws of 1874. Consolidation does not give a railroad exemption from taxation. Immunity of taxation is not one of the franchises of a corporation.

2—74 Maine 382—The tax authorized by the act of 1880 is a tax upon railroad corporations on account of their franchises, and not upon their real or personal estate; that while it is true the amount of the tax is measured by the value of a portion of the corporate property as well as the corporate franchises, still, it is not a tax upon real or personal estate, within the meaning of the constitution, but a tax upon the powers and privileges of these corporations; and that the tax is one which it was constitutionally competent for the legislature to impose."

tute on the 14th day of January, to deliver a temperance address at Gardiner on the 19th of that month, to preside over the state temperance convention at Augusta on the 28th, and to preside at a public temperance meeting in Lewiston early in April. In May he started for Washington with his wife, where he conferred with the Maine delegation. Hannibal Hamlin and Lot M. Morrill were the two senators from Maine, and the members in the lower house were—John H. Burleigh, William P. Frye, James G. Blaine, Samuel F. Hersey and Eugene Hale. May 13 they made a social call upon Mr. and Mrs. Blaine, and there met the congressional delegation. The next evening they dined at Mr. Blaine's. It is related by Mrs. Dingley that there were thirteen at the table, and when Mr. Blaine discovered it, he called in his young son to break the unlucky number. The young man took his seat among the guests, but was too young to appreciate the dignity of the occasion. He was reproved by his father and sent away from the table; and the unlucky number of thirteen again confronted the host, who was strangely superstitious.


Governor Dingley returned home the latter part of May, and attended the graduating exercises of the normal school at Castine, presenting the diplomas to the graduates. On the 30th of May he delivered a memorial address in Lewiston, and early in June addressed a large delegation of Odd Fellows besides presiding over a temperance convention. June 17, Bates college, located in Lewiston, conferred the degree of LL. D., upon Governor Dingley, and on this occasion he made a notable address at the dinner. On the 18th of June he was renominated for governor at the state convention held in the city of Augusta. Thomas B. Reed was one of the delegates to this convention, and was selected as chairman of the committee on resolutions. There were 516 delegates, and Governor Dingley was renominated by acclamation. The platform declared in favor of the resumption of specie payments at the earliest practical day, commended Grant's veto of the currency bill, thanked congress for its action in repealing the salary measure and abolishing the moiety system and cutting down expenditures, declared in favor of developing the resources of the state and approved the prohibition policy of the party and the state executive. Of the latter the platform said: "The Hon. Nelson Dingley Jr., for the ability and fidelity with which he is discharging his duty as governor of Maine, giving careful personal attention to the various institutions and departments of the state, seeking equitable admin-

•

istration to the extent of his constitutional powers, is entitled to the confidence of his fellow-citizens and to their cordial and united support in September for re-election." He was re-elected in September, 1874, receiving 50,865 votes, Joseph Titcomb, the Democratic nominee, receiving 41,898 votes.

From the first of July to the day of election Governor Dingley traveled about the state visiting different localities, addressing temperance meetings, educational conventions, political gatherings and the state muster at Bangor, where, as commander-in-chief of the volunteer militia, he rode at the head of his troops followed by his staff in glittering gold and brass buttons. He was serenaded at Camp Dingley and was given a public reception by General Chamberlain. September 30th he was sent as one of the delegates to the national Congregational council at New Haven, Connecticut. Returning home in October he found time, outside of his duties as governor, to address a temperance meeting at Bangor, one at Houlton and another at Caribou. October 12th he went to Madawaska where he was welcomed by a large cavalcade, such as is known only in that region. December 28 he went to Augusta, and prepared for his second inauguration as governor.

He was inaugurated governor for the second term on the 7th day of January, 1875. In his address to the legislature he called attention to the fact that the financial condition of the state was very favorable. The state debt Jan. 1, 1875, was \$5,561,076. During the year the debt had been reduced \$321,575. He suggested a reduction of the assessment on account of the debt from three to two mills and a renewal of a certain portion of the loans by the issue of bonds payable in the sum of \$200,000 so that sinking funds could be done away with. The amount of money collected from railroads under the corporate franchise tax passed by the previous legislature in accordance with Governor Dingley's recommendation, amounted to \$105,069.33. The Atlantic and St. Lawrence and Maine Central railroads "claim that a clause in their charters exempts them from all taxation until the net income is 10 per cent on the cost of the road." The governor recommended an amendment to act 258 authorizing the supreme judicial court to issue an injunction restraining these railroads from the prosecution of business until they paid the tax. The provision of the special charters the roads claimed to be in the nature of a contract exempting them from taxation. The governor said that "any provision in a charter which pretends to exempt a corporation from taxation, must be held to be void—first because it is not in the power of one legisla-



MAINE STATE CAPITOL.
RESIDENCE OF J. G. BLAINE,
AUGUSTA, MAINE.

ARY

BOOK
STATIONS

ture to bind successive legislatures not to exercise in behalf of the people so essential a sovereign power as the right to impose a tax, and secondly because such a provision is in contravention of the constitution of Maine which declares that all taxes upon real estate, assessed by authority of this state,, shall be apportioned and assessed according to the just value thereof."

He referred to the tax on foreign insurance companies which was bringing a good sum of money into the state treasury and equalizing the burdens of taxation. He said it was the duty of the legislature to make the burdens of taxation as equal as possible and added that "without such a radical reformation as will lead all men to be honest and truthful in rendering statements of their property, it is of course impossible to devise any system of taxation which will be absolutely equal; as capital which is represented by stocks, bonds, loans and currency, cannot be reached by the assessor as readily as that invested in farms, houses, stores, mills, work-shops, ships and other valuable property. At the same time this liability to inequality should be corrected as far as possible. So far as capital is invested directly or indirectly in banking, railroads, telegraphs, express and insurance business, it may be and should be reached. The last legislature inaugurated steps in the right direction with reference to a part of these interests. I earnestly hope that you will continue to press forward measures looking to such a system of taxation as will tend to equalize the public burden. The educational interests of the state are gradually improving. The free high school system inaugurated in 1873 has been very successful. During the year 161 towns have maintained 540 terms of free high schools, affording instruction to 14,000 pupils, at a cost of about \$100,000."

Of the enforcement of the prohibitory laws he said that "laws will accomplish but little alone. But sustained and applied by a public sentiment which brings vividly home to a large majority of citizens the magnitude of the evils of intemperance, it has proved in this state to be an important and indispensable adjunct to the promotion of temperance."

He discussed the loose divorce laws, and recommended an amendment thereof. The supreme court, in answer to questions propounded by the governor and council, had given an opinion that women could not under the constitution act as justices of the peace, or hold any office mentioned in that instrument. The governor suggested the propriety of a commission to propose an

amendment to the constitution, saying: "I know of no sufficient reasons why a woman, otherwise qualified, should be excluded."

The governor then proposed a revision of the state constitution. He said that 55 years had passed since the constitution was framed. It was a series of patch-work, and there was only one way to remedy it, and that was for two-thirds of both houses to vote for a revision, and then have the matter submitted to the people. He recommended that a commission be authorized by the legislature to make such revision.

Referring to the recent business depression, he said that the worst had passed. The country was paying the penalty for indulging in a decade of unparalleled extravagance and speculation, aggravated by an excessive and depreciated currency "to which the necessities of the case obliged us to resort."

He concluded: "The financial panic of the last fifteen months, has exposed the delusive character of the prosperity measured by a false money standard and resting largely on credit, and convinced a whole lot of people that they were living too fast. * * * The obvious remedy lies in an ultimate restoration of the currency to the basis recognized by the civilized world."

In commenting on his second address to the legislature, he wrote: "The governor calls attention to the fact that nearly all the railroad companies assessed by direction of an act of the last legislature, refuse to pay their taxes, and recommends the enlargement of the remedy for the collection of the same by an injunction from the supreme court. This will bring fairly before the legislature the question as to whether or not a tax against railroad corporations shall be collected. The reasons for the taxation of railroads and the enforcement of the tax are presented briefly; and we are sure that the people will sustain the position taken, both with reference to this class of corporations and insurance companies, and also with reference to the question of taxation in general. * * * The gradual improvement in the enforcement of the law prohibiting dram shops is commented on, and the necessity of maintaining an active temperance sentiment pointed out, as a means of further progress. While nearly all the sheriffs have endeavored to do their duty, a few have failed. As sheriffs and county attorneys are elected by the people of the counties, and cannot be appointed or removed by the governor—as Governor Dingley thinks they ought to be, in order to secure the highest efficiency in the enforcement of the law—it is the duty of the temperance voters of the several

counties to see that the right men are elected to the positions. * * He also urges important modifications in our divorce laws, so as to restrain the increasing tendency to sunder the marriage bond. The statistics and remarks of the governor on this point cannot but arouse the public to the necessity of immediate action in this direction. The governor also recommends the abolition of imprisonment for debt where no fraudulent practices are alleged against the debtor; and we regard the position taken as sound and humane. * * * For some years there has been a growing conviction of the necessity of some important changes and additions to our state constitution; but the legislature has had no time to give to the subject. Governor Dingley recommends that the object be reached through a commission of ten eminent citizens from both political parties, who shall meet at Augusta this winter and consider and prepare amendments for the legislature to act upon and submit to the people next September."

A large amount of interest was taken in the election of members of the legislature, the preceding September, as the duty of electing a United States senator was to devolve on that body, and a good deal of activity was displayed by those who favored Hannibal Hamlin for re-election and those who were opposed to him. The legislature was overwhelmingly Republican and Hannibal Hamlin was nominated, and re-elected United States senator on the 19th day of January. The governor's council this year were: J. M. Mason, Geo. Warren, F. C. Perkins, F. E. Richards, Henry Williamson, William Grindle, and Chas. Buffum.

As the result of the recommendations of the governor relative to the collection of railroad taxes, the legislature passed an act to enforce their collection. This law is chapter 16 of the acts of 1875, authorizing the state treasurer to issue his warrant directed to the sheriff of any county, to compel railroads to pay their taxes. Chapter 44, (relating to foreign insurance companies), and chapter 46, (relating to the legal reserves of insurance companies) of the acts of 1875, are the immediate results of Governor Dingley's recommendations.

Perhaps the most important act of this legislature was the passage of a resolution (recommended by the governor) authorizing him to appoint a constitutional commission to recommend certain revisions of the state constitution. The resolution was that "the governor be and hereby is authorized to appoint a commission, consisting of ten persons, to consider and frame such amendments of the constitution of this state as may seem necessary, to be reported

by them to the legislature for such action as may seem advisable, and for final submission to the people at the annual election in September next. Said commission shall assemble as soon as may be, at the state capital and finally submit the result of their labors to the present legislature on or before the 15th day of February next." The resolution was approved by the governor Jan. 12th. He appointed as members of the constitutional commission: Edward Kent, of Bangor; William P. Haines, of Biddeford; George F. Talbot, of Machias; James C. Madigan, of Houlton; Fred A. Pike, of Calais; Washington Gilbert, of Bath; A. P. Gould, of Thomaston; William M. Rust, of Belfast; William J. Kimball, of Paris; Henry E. Robins, of Waterville.

This commission, after due deliberation, submitted 17 amendments to the legislature. Nine were submitted to the people by a resolution adopted Feb. 24th, and all were adopted at the annual election Sept. 13, 1875. These amendments were as follows:

1—XIII—In relation to the election of senators by a plurality vote.

2—XIV—Special legislation and corporations.

3—XV—Power of governor to pardon.

4—XVI—Appointment of judges of municipal and police courts.

5—XVII—Taxation.

6—XVIII—Abolishing the land agency.

7—XIX—Constitutional conventions.

8—XX—Bribery at elections.

9—XXI—Codification of the amended constitution.

The railroads of the state, especially those which resisted the payment of the tax, fought bitterly the recommendations of the governor and the proposed legislation to force the collection of unpaid taxes. Hon. Anson P. Morrill appeared before the judiciary committee for the Maine Central railroad and denounced the governor and his recommendation. Chas. Goddard, who was employed by the Maine Central, tried to have the matter postponed until the court settled it. Mr. Morrill threatened to have the matter carried into the courts; but Governor Dingley held his ground, and the legislature stood by him. The fight between the state and the railroads, as has already been stated, was carried on, through the courts, for five years, before it was finally settled.

Governor Dingley was urged to be a candidate for governor for a third term, but on the 12th day of April he recorded in his diary that "he had decided not to be a candidate for governor." But the

state convention which met in June of that year, did not adjourn without paying him a just tribute. One of the resolutions recited that "Hon. Nelson Dingley Jr., the able and upright executive of Maine, is entitled to the thanks of the people of the state for the intelligence, the integrity, the fidelity and the ability with which he has discharged the responsibilities and duties of his office."

Throughout his second term as governor, Mr. Dingley kept in close touch with the people of the state. On the 21st of January he presided over the state temperance convention held at Augusta. On the 18th of April he was in Boston attending the celebration of the commemoration of Robert Newton's signal to Paul Revere. Services were held at the old North church. On the 19th of April he was at Concord, Mass.,¹ where he delivered an address at the centennial celebration of the Concord fight. Tables to accommodate four thousand persons were placed in rows running across the tent from side to side. On the platform were tables to accommodate two hundred. At the center table were the president of the day, E. Rockwood Hoar, R. W. Emerson, Hon. James G. Blaine, and Hon. Joseph R. Hawley. On the right were Gov. Ingersoll of Connecticut and staff, Gov. Dingley of Maine and staff, Gov. Peck of Vermont and staff; and on the left G. E. Boutwell, G. F. Hoar and President Eliot. On the 29th of April he went to Biddeford where he was received and escorted by the military of Saco and Biddeford and in the evening given a reception. In May he was at Belfast and Castine (where he attended the exercises of the normal school), and at Biddeford on the 30th day of the month where he delivered a Memorial day address. June 3rd he was at Kent's Hill where he addressed the graduating class. Thence he went to Augusta, Waterville, Bucksport, and Ellsworth, where he conferred with Congressman Hale, and where he was serenaded in the evening. June 11th he was at Cherryfield and Machias, receiving a serenade at the latter place. The next day he made an address at the centennial celebration of that city and on the 13th went to East Machias and Machiasport, thence to Portland by steamer. On the 16th of June he started for Boston to attend the centennial exercises commemorating the battle of Bunker Hill. At Portland he was joined by his staff, and escorted to Music hall by the Portland cadets and there given a reception. On the 24th of June he made an address at the Maine central institute, and later in the month at Farmington where he was serenaded. On the following day he

1—See Appendix.

presented the diplomas to the graduates of the normal school in that city. July 7th he visited President Chamberlain at Bowdoin college, where he heard Longfellow read his poem before the class of 1825. July 28th he attended commencement at Waterville college, and on the 17th of August addressed a temperance camp-meeting at Old Orchard. The latter part of August he addressed a Republican mass meeting in Lewiston and early in the following month addressed a temperance meeting at Portland. Thus he led a busy and active life.

The state election was held September 13th, and Selden Connor was elected governor by 4,500 majority. The result was a disappointment to the Maine Republicans. The Democrats had gained over 12,000 votes over the year before, and the Republicans were very much surprised. Gov. Dingley said: "If there are any Republicans who think that the presidential contest of next year is to be a holiday affair, they may as well open their eyes to the situation." In this election the Republicans stayed at home. They seemed to be alarmingly apathetic. The Greenback party was just making its appearance in state affairs, and Gov. Dingley began the discussion of the currency question in earnest, preparing for the contest of 1876. He wrote that "nothing but gold redemption will make the greenback as good as gold."

On the 10th day of October there was a great temperance reform meeting in Lewiston addressed by Governor Dingley. Later in the month he addressed the West Oxford Agricultural society, visited the Indians at Oldtown, the normal school at Farmington (where he delivered a temperance address), and on the 15th of November went to Augusta to prepare for his departure from the executive office. In Augusta he was the guest of General Connor,¹ Gov.-elect. January 3rd he went to the state capitol as governor for the last time, and on the following day he was busy closing up state affairs. On the 5th day of the month the state legislature was organized, and Governor Dingley administered the oath of office to the members. While sitting in the governor's room that evening, his military staff and other friends visited him and through General Murray, presented him with a costly and beautiful statuette of "The Muse of History." He was taken greatly by surprise, and replied fittingly and feelingly to the brief presentation address. On the

¹—Former Governor Selden Connor writes the author of these volumes: "My clearest and pleasantest recollection of Mr. Dingley relates to the week he was our guest while attending the last meeting in his administration, of the governor and council. We all enjoyed his society exceedingly, and he gave me much valuable information in regard to the duties I was about entering upon as his successor in office. Mr. Dingley was my friend and supporter."

next day, Jan. 6th, 1876, Gov. Connor was inaugurated; and Gov. Dingley retired from the gubernatorial office ¹ after serving two years successfully and ably. In the afternoon he was at the state house where he bade adieu to his council. He wrote in his diary: "We all felt sad at parting. This is the pleasantest part of official position—retiring from office." January 7th he returned to his home in Lewiston and recorded this brief but feeling comment: "I am glad to be at home again, free from official cares." Thus Governor Dingley retired from public office until, five years later, he was called to higher duties in the city of Washington.

During these years of arduous public labor, Mr. Dingley's domestic life was unusually happy, and his family circle a source of joy to him. Five sons and one daughter had come to him, one departing this life in infancy. He was fond of his children and deeply devoted to his wife. While absorbed in the responsibilities of the office of governor and absent from his dear ones, he recorded in his diary: "God enable me to be entirely devoted to my dear wife.

" 'Take the bright shell from its home on the lea

And wherever it goes, it will sing of the sea ;

So take the fond heart, from its home and its hearth,

'Twill sing of the love to the ends of the earth.' "

1—Hon. S. J. Chadbourne writes of Governor Dingley as follows: "He was twice governor of the state, first in 1874, succeeding himself in 1876. His administration was an able one, marked for its economy in all branches of the public service wherever his influence was felt. His ability was recognized by the leading men of both parties and there are those today, Republicans and Democrats, who fully believe he was one of the best, if not the best governor Maine ever had. He distinguished himself by his efforts to secure revenue for the state from sources heretofore not available and he urged a strong hard fight which resulted in 1874 in the passage of 'an act for the taxation of railroads.' The railroads continued the fight and carried the matter to the courts, but it was finally decided in favor of the state, and has resulted in the production of a large annual revenue, which has tended to lessen the burden of the tax payers and endeared him to the hearts of the farmers of the state who still remember him as a benefactor. It was a hard fought contest and his efforts were most bitterly resisted by some of the railroads, but it made his administration celebrated because of his espousal of the cause of the common people. It was a great victory for Governor Dingley."

CHAPTER IX.

1876-1878.

In 1876, Seldon Connor, was renominated by the Republicans of Maine for governor on a distinctly sound-money platform. This was on the 21st of June. Mr. Dingley was present and made a notable speech at this convention. He urged the Republicans to take a firm stand on the money question, denounced the proposition of the Greenbackers and advocated the resumption of specie payments.

A notable event at this period in Mr. Dingley's career, was the famous Brooklyn council, summoned by the Congregational churches of the country to determine the guilt or innocence of Henry Ward Beecher. Mr. Dingley and Dr. Warren were selected as delegates from the Congregational church in Lewiston to attend this Plymouth church advisory council. There were 191 ministers and 171 laymen. The council assembled in the city of Brooklyn February 15, 1876. Rev. Dr. Bacon was chosen moderator, and Mr. Dingley was chosen assistant moderator.¹ On the 17th, Mr. Dingley presided over that notable assembly. The several questions were first considered by very able committees and then referred to a special committee of nine, consisting of President Por-

1.—Mr. Dingley received the following letter from Mr. Beecher: Monday, February, 1867. Gov. Dingley. My dear sir: Will you not request eight or ten gentlemen of the council to meet the church committee at Mr. Sherman's at nine tomorrow morning. We want to speak with you respecting Moulton—the new evidence so called and a few other matters bearing upon a thorough and final work by council. You will know who are astute, thorough and impartially wise; and if you will select them and ask them to meet at nine a. m. (perhaps it will be just as well to make the request openly and say that you had taken the liberty of selecting the persons) it will, I think, be worth all the trouble. Please say to bearer if you deem it wise to comply. Cordially yours, Henry Ward Beecher.

ter of Yale college, Rev. Dr. Bacon of New Haven, Rev. Dr. Strong of Boston, Rev. Dr. Salter of Iowa, President Sturtevant of Illinois college, President Fairchild of Oberlin, Judge Wood of Albany, Judge Wythe of Minnesota, and Former Governor Dingley of Maine. It is needless to say that the proceedings of the council attracted crowds of people. On the 20th of February Mr. Dingley heard Mr. Beecher preach and Moody and Sankey sing. Under the circumstances it was a most impressive religious exercise. The sub-committee made its report and expressed regret that the course provided in Matthew XVIII was not adopted at the beginning of the controversy. The church had already thoroughly investigated the scandal.

On the 24th of February the council closed with a public meeting. Plymouth church was packed and President Porter, and Dr. Bacon made notable speeches. Mr. Beecher replied, stating in the course of his speech most dramatically: "Before God I am utterly incapable of committing the crime charged against me. My soul revolts at the thought." Then the vast congregation sang "Jesus Lover of My Soul," and dispersed. Thus closed the largest and most notable ecclesiastical council of the kind ever convened in this country. Throughout this trying affair, Mr. Dingley stoutly maintained that Mr. Beecher was innocent; and the latter expressed his deep appreciation of Mr. Dingley's loyalty and support, in subsequent acts of kindness and manifestations of deep regard. His personal letters to Mr. Dingley were marked by expressions of genuine affection.

It was about this time that James G. Blaine was talked of for president. He had made a brilliant record as a member of the lower house of congress, and had promoted the interests of his party and his country, and had taken a popular and impregnable stand on the questions of amnesty and currency. Maine was anxious to honor her chosen son, and on the 20th of January Mr. Dingley, at the request of Mr. Blaine, was chosen by the state legislature, chairman of the Maine delegation to the national Republican convention.¹

The friends and supporters of Mr. Blaine in his own state—those who knew him best—were not disturbed by the cruel charges made against him on the floor of the national house. Mr. Blaine's

1—Mr. J. H. Manley writes the editor of these volumes: "I remember very well why Mr. Dingley was selected as a delegate. It was at Mr. Blaine's suggestion. He said to me and others that he desired Mr. Dingley to be a delegate and represent him because he was his loyal friend, a man of great discretion and rare judgment of men, and one of the representative men of Maine, who knew many of the public men of the country. Mr. Dingley shared Mr. Blaine's confidence and he had unbounded faith in his judgment."

own vigor and brilliant qualities, had made him enemies; and it was not surprising that at this critical juncture in his political career, some of them searched high and low for material with which to forge an instrument to stab him in the back and strike him down before his state and the nation. His answer to these charges on the floor of the house April 24th, 1876, were deemed a complete exoneration, not only by his immediate friends, but by impartial observers and students of political history. The second district Republican convention to elect delegates to the national convention was held in the city of Auburn. Mr. Dingley was chairman of the committee on resolutions, and framed the resolutions that were adopted. They congratulated the Republicans and the country "on the signal manner in which the people have expressed their condemnation of the wicked attempt to overthrow the popular verdict at the polls;" declared for Blaine "as the candidate of the Republican party for president, believing that he is a man pre-eminently fitted to lead the Republican party to victory in the coming national campaign, and to fill the presidential chair with ability and success." Concerning the temperance cause, the resolutions said: "In spite of jeers, in spite of opposition, in spite of declarations, that the temperance cause is retrograding instead of advancing, the good work will go on in Maine, and year by year will show new triumphs in the great battle against King Alcohol."

At the second district congressional convention in Auburn, Congressman Frye was renominated; and Mr. Dingley on this occasion said in the course of his speech: "I predict that the Republicans will nominate at Cincinnati Maine's true and tried statesman, James G. Blaine." At a meeting of the state Blaine club held at the Augusta house, Frederick Robie presided. Mr. Dingley was present and spoke in behalf of Mr. Blaine. Hon. John L. Stevens and Hon. C. A. Boutelle, were also present and made vigorous addresses. There was great enthusiasm among the followers and admirers of Maine's chieftain, and it was voted that the delegation from the state of Maine should establish its headquarters at the Burnett house and the Grand hotel and should leave Portland June 9th in special cars. The delegation left for the scene of the conflict, at the appointed hour. The delegates were as follows: Nelson Dingley Jr., John L. Stevens, J. H. Drummond, Francis Cobb, J. M. Brown, J. M. Stone, William P. Frye, Enoch Foster Jr., R. B. Shepherd, Edwin Flye, C. A. Boutelle, J. M. Mayo, S. L. Millikin and Eugene Hale. The Blaine and Maine headquarters were in two spacious parlors on the second floor of the Burnett house. At the

Grand hotel were the friends of Conkling with one thousand trained workers and many brass bands. There was intense excitement. The headquarters of the different candidates were thronged with political workers, and the air was blue with the smoke of the conflict. The city was beautifully decorated, Blaine's pictures adorning every window and every available space.

June 12th, while Mr. Dingley and the other members of the Maine delegation were busy canvassing the situation, circulating among the different delegations, and urging upon them the claims of their favorite candidate, they were stunned by the report from Washington that Mr. Blaine had received a sun stroke. This startling information came like a flash of lightning from a clear sky; but a second dispatch announcing that it was not a sun stroke but only a slight ill-turn due to excessive excitement, quieted the fears of the friends of Mr. Blaine, and they redoubled their efforts to secure his nomination. Mr. Dingley and Mr. Hale received frequent messages from Mr. Blaine in Washington, the Maine candidate having arranged for a special wire in his residence at the capital. There was a lobby doing effective work for Senator Morton of Indiana, while a large delegation of New York Greeley Republicans circulated about the hotels and the different headquarters and made things lively. All day long, June 13th, the canvassing was proceeding and excitement rising to fever heat. The convention met in Exposition hall, where Greeley was nominated in 1872. The committee on resolutions of which Mr. Dingley was the member from Maine, met early in the evening at the club room and discussed matters in a desultory fashion until nearly midnight. Nobody had prepared full resolutions. The only resolution ready for consideration was one prepared by Former Attorney-General Speed on civil service. This was promptly adopted. The money question, the tariff and every other public question was informally discussed; but little was accomplished. Finally about midnight, it dawned upon the members of the committee that a sub-committee must be appointed if anything was to be accomplished. This was done, and at half-past twelve in the morning the sub-committee, consisting of Gen. Hawley of Connecticut, Gen. Speed of Ky., Gov. Chamberlain, of S. C., Former Gov. Dingley of Maine, Chas. Emory Smith of N. Y., (postmaster general in President McKinley's cabinet) and Judge Howe, of Wisconsin, retired in private. Mr. Dingley was particularly interested in the question of schools and framed the section that was adopted declaring that "the public

school system of the several states is the bulwark of the American republic; and with a view to its security and permanence, we recommend an amendment to the constitution of the United States, forbidding the application of any public fund or property for the benefit of any schools or institutions under sectarian control." The money¹ and tariff planks were the products of the combined efforts of the members of the sub-committee, each submitting his views. At the last moment Mr. Smith, who was the youngest member and secretary of the sub-committee, suggested that there should be a brief but sharp indictment of the Democratic party. He read what had been inserted in the New York Republican state platform that year (he was then a resident of New York) which so pleased the committee that it was adopted at once as section sixteen of the platform. The sub-committee did not finish its labors until six o'clock in the morning and reported to the full committee shortly before nine in the morning. Through its chairman, Gen. Hawley, the full committee reported to the convention.

The convention met at 10 o'clock in the morning June 16th, and proceeded to ballot. It was a very hot day, and the delegates were at a very high temperature. The story of that convention is well known to students of political history. The name of Mr. Blaine had been presented by that matchless orator, Robert Ingersoll, who in a speech of remarkable power and unusual eloquence, carried the convention off its feet. It was in this speech that Mr. Ingersoll referred to Mr. Blaine as the "Plumed Knight," which sobriquet attached to Mr. Blaine for the remainder of his life. This speech was the event of the convention. Mr. Blaine's nomination was regarded almost certain when the balloting began. The other prominent candidates were Oliver P. Morton, of Indiana, Roscoe Conkling, of New York, Benjamin F. Bristow, of Kentucky, and James F. Hartranft, of Pennsylvania. Bristow's power came from the element dissatisfied with Grant's administration. Bristow, after a personal quarrel with Grant, had resigned from the cabinet. The supporters of Blaine came to him by reason of his popularity and his reputation as a congressional leader.

For six ballots the delegates struggled between the several candidates. The friends of Mr. Blaine rallied their forces and did

1—The financial plank of these resolutions was as follows: "In the first act of congress signed by President Grant, the national government assumed to remove any doubt of its purpose to discharge all just obligations to the public creditors, and solemnly pledged its faith to make provisions at the earliest practical period for the redemption of the U. S. notes in coin. Commercial prosperity, public morals and national credit demand that the promise be fulfilled by a steady progress to specie payment."

everything in their power to secure the desired result. The enemies of Mr. Blaine, headed by Roscoe Conkling and his followers, finding that Mr. Blaine was likely to be nominated, if they adhered to their original plan, on the seventh ballot changed front, concentrated their forces on Rutherford B. Hayes and nominated him amid wild excitement.

It is needless to say that Mr. Blaine's friends, not only in Maine, but all over the country, were disappointed over the result. But Mr. Blaine, with characteristic generosity, immediately telegraphed to Mr. Hayes, congratulating him upon his nomination. He also sent messages to Mr. Dingley, the chairman of the Maine delegation, and to the others who did such noble work in keeping the Blaine lines intact. It is needless to now discuss the causes of Mr. Blaine's defeat. Like all positive public men, he had bitter enemies as well as warm friends; and the influence of Cincinnati and of a large percentage of those in attendance upon the convention as spectators, was against the candidate from Maine. But Mr. Blaine apparently was the least disappointed of all; and it is interesting to note that he predicted a fortnight before the convention, to Jeremiah S. Black, that in all probability "The Great Unknown," would be nominated. This prediction came true.

Mr. Dingley returned to Maine by way of Washington, and when in the latter place called upon Mr. Blaine. This was June 18, 1876. Mr. Blaine received the chairman of the Maine delegation with unusual warmth. His deepest regret was that he had caused his friends so much labor and so much anxiety. On the 20th of June Mr. Dingley was once more in his home circle.

The state campaign opened August 21st. Mr. Blaine and Mr. Ingersoll spoke at a Republican rally in the city of Lewiston. Mr. Dingley entered this campaign with his usual zeal, speaking every night for ten days and advocating the election of Governor Connor and the triumph of the Republican sound money platform. September 9th, the day before election, Mr. Blaine spoke in City hall, Lewiston. It is unnecessary to state that the meeting was a grand success. The defeated candidate for president was received by his friends and admirers in Lewiston with unbounded enthusiasm. Governor Connor was re-elected by about, 15,000 majority; and the event was celebrated in Lewiston by a torchlight procession. The entire Republican congressional ticket was elected—Thomas B. Reed, William P. Frye, Stephen D. Lindsey, Llewellyn Powers and Eugene Hale. Connor received 75,867 votes, Talbot, the Demo-

cratic nominee for governor, 60,423 votes. Almon Gage, the Greenback candidate for governor received only 520 votes.

The national campaign followed quickly on the heels of the state campaign; and in this Mr. Dingley took part. Hayes was elected president November 7th, receiving 4,033,768 votes and Tilden 4,285,099 votes. There were 81,737 Greenback votes and 9,522 Prohibition votes. Tilden had a majority of the popular vote, but Hayes, after a memorable struggle in which the aid of an electoral commission was invoked, was declared elected by a majority of one in the electoral college. Mr. Dingley warmly defended the electoral commission as the only safe and constitutional way out of the difficulty; and it is to the everlasting credit of the American people and their form of government, as well as the Democratic party, that the decision was acquiesced in on all sides, and peace and quiet restored.

In addition to his political and journalistic duties, Mr. Dingley found time to deliver several lectures, attend temperance conventions and farmers' gatherings during the fall and winter. November 15th, Henry Ward Beecher lectured in Lewiston and was a guest at Mr. Dingley's home, where old friendships were renewed.

On the 12th day of January, 1877, Mr. Dingley received an invitation to attend a reception at Mr. Blaine's home in Augusta, but sickness prevented him from accepting. Late in January he attended a state temperance convention, and on the 15th of March a banquet given to Congressman Frye at his home in Lewiston. From the first of April to the first of July he devoted his time to journalistic labors, temperance addresses and Sunday school conventions.

The Republican state convention held August 9th, was a stormy gathering. There was a fight over the platform as well as the nominee. Governor Connor, however, was renominated. Joseph H. Williams was the regular Democratic candidate for governor and Henry C. Munson the Greenback candidate. In that election the Greenback vote was about 4,000, and Selden Connor was elected governor by about 6,000 majority. The election over, Mr. Dingley on the 20th of September spoke at Skowhegan on "Farming as a Remedy for Hard Times." This lecture was really a campaign speech; for it was intended as a complete answer to the complaint of the farmers of the state that the Republican policy had brought about the panic of 1873. It was the hard times accompanying and

following this panic, and the struggle to place the country again upon a specie basis, that caused the financial stress of the times.

October 17th Mr. Dingley attended the triennial Congregational council in the city of Detroit; ¹ and on the 25th delivered an address on "The Scholar and the State," ² before the national Zeta Psi convention at Cleveland. From Cleveland he went to Chicago and thence to St. Paul and Minneapolis where he met many old friends from the state of Maine. Returning home early in November, he made a temperance address at Portland November 6th, lectured in West Falmouth on "Duties of Citizens of the Republic," spoke at Pittsfield December 4th on the currency question, lectured December 6th at East Winthrop on the Mormons; and at Winthrop addressed the state reform temperance convention. In addition to all this, on the 16th of December he successfully carried through an effort to raise the debt of the Pine street Congregational church, of which he was a member. In one Sunday through his earnest efforts as a leader, \$10,500 was raised among the members and attendants of the church.

From early manhood Mr. Dingley had been a consistent advocate of the cause of temperance. The state of Maine through the efforts of men like Mr. Dingley, had taken an advanced position on this question, and had incorporated the principles of prohibition in the state law and finally in the constitution. The first important movement in behalf of prohibition was in 1851, when leading members of the Sons of Temperance—Joshua Nye of Waterville, John S. Kimball of Bangor, H. K. Morrill of Gardiner, and Samuel L. Carleton of Portland—advocated a state movement. The organization known as Good Templars was founded in 1860. ³ It was the

1—Five names were proposed for moderator and two hundred votes cast, out of which President Chapin of Beloit college, Wis., received fifty; Ex-Gov. W. B. Washburn of Massachusetts, eighty-three; Nelson Dingley Jr., of Maine, twenty-five; Col. C. G. Hammond of Chicago, forty-one; and Rev. J. F. Gaylord, one. Mr. Dingley and Col. Hammond withdrew on the second ballot which resulted in the election of Mr. Washburn. For first assistant moderator President Chapin was chosen without opposition and for second assistant Mr. Dingley's name was again proposed but he withdrew in favor of Col. Hammond before a ballot was taken.

During the session of the council Mr. Dingley was placed upon the committee on the American Missionary report. He was also chosen one of the five delegates to the general conference of the Methodist Episcopal church, he being the only lay delegate selected.

2—See Appendix.

3—Grant Rogers, grand secretary of Maine Good Templars, writes the editor of these volumes: "Hon. Nelson Dingley Jr. was initiated into membership by United Lodge No. 12, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Lewiston, Feb. 11, 1867. At none of the anniversaries of United lodge are the names of the lamented brothers forgotten. It is ever the proud boast of this lodge that Nelson Dingley was a member until his death. At the 9th annual session of the grand lodge of Maine, held at Bangor, beginning April 2, 1867, Mr. Dingley was elevated to the

first order to acknowledge the right and duty of women to labor equally with the men in the temperance reform. This included in its ranks a large number of most faithful and efficient friends of the cause, men and women, who were never tired of doing good. Neal Dow, the famous apostle of prohibition says in his reminiscences: "I recall as having been connected with the order such men as Major H. A. Shorey, Rev. David Boyd, Rev. Smith Baker, Rev. H. C. Munson, George E. Brackett. At the head of the Good Templars in Maine for a time was Nelson Dingley Jr., afterwards governor of the state, and now (1885) a member of congress from this state. Able, honest, indefatigable, and conscientious in everything he undertakes, Governor Dingley is sure to be useful and influential in any movement that is fortunate enough to receive his approval and assistance. Maine owes much to him for what he has done for her in various fields, but friends of temperance here and everywhere have reason to be especially thankful for his constant, unswerving, and consistent devotion to that cause."

The Maine law enacted in 1851 was entitled an act "to suppress drinking houses and tippling shops." The political effect of the Democratic opposition to the Maine law, is best shown by noting the fact that in 1852 the Democratic majority in the state was 33,000, while in 1856 the Republican majority was 19,000. The Democrats sought to punish Governor Hubbard for approving the law; but the people took the matter in their own hands, and rebuked the party that dared to oppose the suppression of the liquor traffic.

At that time Rev. John L. Stevens was one of Neal Dow's co-laborers. He was then a Universalist clergyman, but later went into politics. He was a personal friend and political confidant of James G. Blaine, receiving several appointments at his hand, the last being minister to the Hawaiian Islands.

highest office in the gift of the grand lodge, that of Grand Worthy Chief Templar, which office he held for two years. During the last years of the sixties, also in the seventies his name is often found on important committees with Joshua Nye, Major H. A. Shorey, and other temperance leaders of those days. He was several times sent as a representative to the right worthy grand lodge which is now known as the international supreme lodge. He was universally respected and admired by all of his temperance associates. No greater praise of him can be said than that he withstood the contaminating influence of politics and the investigations incident to the holding of high political office, and came through it all with a clean record and enjoying the same high confidence of the temperance leaders, which was his in private life. His name is the synonym of loyalty and unfaltering devotion to the principles taught by Good Templary. When surrounded by the social customs of public life in congress, where weaker men would have compromised he remained true to the doctrine taught by Good Templary: "Total abstinence for the individual and prohibition for the state and nation." "

A convention of bolting Democrats in 1853 nominated Anson P. Morrill for governor. Ten days later he made a speech denouncing the position of the Democratic party on the Maine law. This led to his nomination by the Maine Law party in 1854. Neal Dow said that "Anson P. Morrill was a man of ability and integrity, of courage, of political skill and experience."

William Pitt Fessenden's first election to the United States senate was due to the disaffections in the Democratic party largely growing out of the temperance question; and it is interesting to note that no Democrat has been sent to the United States senate from the state of Maine since 1847, when James W. Bradbury was elected for the term beginning in 1847 and closing in 1853. This was largely due to the temperance movement in politics. Lot M. Morrill was the regular Democratic candidate for United States senator, but was defeated by William Pitt Fessenden. There was great excitement at this legislative convention, the temperance forces carrying the day. Subsequently Messrs. Fessenden and Morrill were colleagues in the United States senate and both were afterwards secretaries of the treasury. In 1857, Lot M. Morrill was elected governor, and the Maine law, which had been superseded a short time previous by high license, was re-enacted; and in 1883 prohibition was placed, by a vote of the people, in the constitution of the state.

Neal Dow and Mr. Dingley were warm personal friends. The latter, however, believed that it was better for the temperance forces to remain within the ranks of the Republican party than to form a separate party which would inevitably draw its greater proportion of voters from the Republican party. Mr. Dingley looked at the question from a practical point of view, desiring to accomplish results. He was a temperance man not only in theory but in practice, and held a spotless reputation in his own home and district as well as in the state and country at large. Notwithstanding this, it is strange to relate, that the third party Prohibitionists almost invariably nominated candidates against him. But Mr. Dingley recognized the true worth of Neal Dow; and when that veteran warrior in the cause of temperance passed away at a ripe old age, he paid him this tribute: "And as the years pass, the nobility of his character, the fidelity of his life, and the unselfishness of his aims will be more and more recognized."

As an editor and a public speaker, Mr. Dingley advanced the cause of temperance. Beginning in his boyhood, he was a cham-

pion of its principles. He was active in nearly all the organizations by which temperance was promoted and encouraged. Through the Lewiston Journal and by his public addresses he did most effective service in the cause. One of the most notable addresses he made was at a mass temperance convention at Sebago Lake, in August, 1879. Among other things he said: "While on the one hand Maine is pointed to by the friends of temperance abroad as well as at home as an example of temperance progress, on the other hand it is earnestly contended that there has been no real advance, and that there is proportionately as much liquor sold and drank in the state as ever. This controversy is due to the fact that Maine has combated King Alcohol with a two-edged sword—moral suasion and legal agencies instead of the former alone. Had we been content to use only moral agencies, the enemies of temperance would certainly have found no fault with our policy. The activity which they now show in representing that our prohibitory policy is a failure is evidence that it has touched the liquor trade in a weak spot. Those who deny that there has been any improvement in the drinking habits of the people of Maine, endeavor to create the impression that we have abandoned moral means and are relying entirely on legal agencies. These men wilfully overlook the fact that in no other state has there been so general a use of moral agencies in promoting temperance reform as in Maine. The most potent moral movements that have ever been known, had their origin here. The prohibitionists of this state have ever been foremost in moral work. They have simply used legal as a buttress of moral suasion. They have done this in order that the men saved by moral agencies might be aided in keeping their good resolutions by the removal of the dram shop temptation. They have felt, also, that in the realm of morals, as well as religion, the law is a school-master to lift men to a better life. We are told that the use of law in promoting sobriety and virtue is inconsistent with the use of persuasion; that men cannot be made sober by law. It is amazing that candid men should present this objection, when they see no inconsistency in the use of the other laws to aid moral agencies. It is admitted that laws prohibiting gambling saloons and other vices are powerful aids to moral means in promoting virtue. They remove temptation which would seriously weaken the influence of good resolutions. So laws prohibiting dram shops, not only brand the drinking habit as wrong, but also lessen the temptation which otherwise would stare men in the face, and destroy much of moral work." In con-

clusion, Mr. Dingley urged the friends of temperance to stand on the rock of total abstinence as the only platform on which permanent temperance triumphs can be won.

The influence which Mr. Dingley had on the social and temperance side of the community, cannot be over-estimated. Former Governor Perham undoubtedly voices the sentiment of the temperance people of Maine and of the whole country when he says: "As a constant observer, and to some extent, a co-worker with him, I feel justified in expressing the opinion that with the exception of Neal Dow, no other man in Maine has done so much to create and maintain the strong public sentiment in favor of total abstinence for which the state is distinguished." Verily his works live after him.

CHAPTER X.

1878-1879.

The Greenback party made its first appearance in American politics, with the nomination of William Allen for governor of Ohio, by the Democratic state convention of 1874, in opposition to Rutherford B. Hayes, upon a platform containing a soft-money clause. This party made its first appearance in Maine with the introduction into the Democratic state convention of 1875, by Solon Chase, of Turner, of a resolution containing this Ohio clause. The resolution was rejected. Before the next campaign, Solon Chase established a Greenback paper, and a party was formed which nominated Almon Gage of Lewiston for governor, who received 520 votes. The Republican state convention which renominated Gov. Connor in 1877 adopted this financial plank: "A sound currency—based on coin and redeemable in coin—is essential to the prosperity of the people. Its attainment would impart confidence to capital, secure remunerative employment to labor, decrease the expense of living, remove stagnation from trade, and greatly promote the development of commerce in which Maine is so deeply interested. We therefore demand that in the resumption of specie payment, the promise of the national government be kept in an honest, straightforward manner, and that no backward or sideway steps be taken." Senator Blaine was a member of the committee on resolutions.

The Greenback vote this year was about 5,000; and the Republicans of the state were beginning to be somewhat alarmed over the growth of the new financial doctrine, plausible on its face, but absolutely false in principle. Solon Chase with his paper and "them steers," exercised a hypnotic influence over the voters who em-

braced the new financial doctrine as a panacea for all ills. He campaigned over the state with this yoke of oxen and rallied to the support of his ideas thousands of farmers who were suffering from the hard times which followed the panic of 1873 and accompanied the return of the country to a sound specie basis.

Solon Chase, the chief apostle of Greenbackism in Maine, was a rare and shrewd character. He had had experience in the state legislature and used the vernacular of the farmer and backwoodsman that captivated the tillers of the soil. Moreover he was a quick witted man, a glib talker, and a debater full of sophistry and plain homely illustrations drawn from the farmer's experiences, that were dangerous to the Republican party and the whole state.¹

The Republican national convention of 1876 demanded "continued and steady progress to specie payment." The Democrats denounced the Republican plan of resumption and predicted that it would end in a new suspension which would be a "fresh calamity, prolific of confusion, distrust and distress." The election of Ruth-erford B. Hayes gave the country fresh confidence and courage, and the greenback rose to 94.7 cents in gold in May, 1877. But the Greenbackers thought the Republicans were in league with the money kings to rob the people; and they denounced the payment of the greenbacks in coin. They said that fiat money was good enough for them, and advocated the issue of greenbacks until all should be rich, happy and prosperous.

As editor of the Lewiston Journal, Mr. Dingley was one of the first men of prominence to sound the note of alarm and to combat the false financial theories of the Greenbackers. In the state and national campaigns of 1876, and in the state campaign of 1877, he fought with voice and pen the false and pernicious doctrine of greenbackism as taught by Solon Chase and "them steers." In the winter of 1877-78, the Republicans of Maine were alarmed over the situation. The farmers were flocking to the support of the new doctrine and it looked as if the Greenbackers would sweep the state in the next election. Some of the Republican leaders wanted to compromise and yield to the craze; but Mr. Dingley urged a bold and steady opposition. He argued that greenbackism was a craze founded on false principles and would soon pass away. He maintained that the Republicans could not afford to yield one iota; that they should stick to their colors and fight it out "if it took all sum-

1—The New York Times attributed Solon Chase's success to his great energy, homespun pride and shocking bad hat, and to his discussions at the corner grocery.

mer," and he might have added if it took all winter. The Lewiston Journal was in the thickest of the fight. It was a light unto the Republican hosts in their hour of trial; and Mr. Dingley was their guide—their rock to which they clung. With implicit faith they followed his leadership, trusting in his wisdom and wise generalship.

Early in February of that year, a committee from the state Greenback organization sent a challenge to Mr. Dingley to debate with Solon Chase, the financial issues of the hour and the doctrine of greenbackism. Mr. Dingley promptly accepted this challenge and agreed to meet Mr. Chase in a joint discussion at Auburn hall. That evening Auburn hall was packed; and Solon Chase the idol and apostle of the Greenbackers, exhausted all his logic and wit in support of his pet ideas. But Mr. Dingley in a calm and candid manner, with solid chunks of reason bolstered up by facts, dealt blow after blow against the fortress erected by Mr. Chase, and before the discussion was over completely demolished it.¹ The supporters of both Mr. Dingley and Mr. Chase were out in large force, and loudly applauded every good point. This debate was reported stenographically by J. D. Pulsifer of Auburn, and published in full. This report of a discussion between the two giants of Maine representing both sides of the controversy, did more to clear up the political atmosphere and hold in line wavering Republicans, particularly farmers, than anything else that occurred that year; and Mr. Dingley displayed his wide and accurate knowledge of the subject, thus placing himself among the foremost students of finance not only in the state, but in the whole country. Throughout that spring, Mr. Dingley made political and temperance addresses and delivered many of his popular lectures. On the 29th of July he attended a conference of the state Republican committee in Portland and on the next day, July 30th, attended, as a delegate, the state convention which renominated Governor Connor. In this convention Mr. Dingley was a member of the committee on resolutions and framed the financial plank which read: "We demand honest money for the people. Our currency must be made as good as coin and redeemable in it. The government promised this. The Re-

1—Solon Chase writes: "I served two terms in the Maine legislature with Mr. Dingley and knew him and respected him during his active life. The secret of his success was the pains-taking hard work he put into whatever he was engaged in. He was not an expert in everything, but he was an expert in what he undertook. When I began to preach the gospel according to 'them steers,' Nelson Dingley did not meet me with ridicule. He met me with logic in joint debate. He presented the strong points of his side of the question with force and simplicity, and after twenty years of discussion no points that he did not then make have been presented."

publican party has legislated to perform it, and in the course of resumption, now nearly accomplished, there must be no steps sideways or backwards. We congratulate our fellow-citizens on the unmistakable evidence that the near approach of a stable currency is preparing the way for an early permanent revival of business and industry, so long depressed by causes growing out of a gigantic civil war, among which a depreciated and fluctuating currency is the most prominent and greatly aggravated by the mischievous agitation of demagogues in and out of congress for measures which, if adopted as the policy of the government, would bring permanent disaster, and ruin to business, discredit and dishonor upon the nation, and tend to subvert many of those principles which are fundamental to the existence of civilized society." Congressman Hale presented the report of the committee on resolutions, while Senator Hamlin, General Stewart L. Woodford, Senator Blaine, and Congressman Frye, made addresses.

The Greenback state convention was held in Auburn hall, June 4th. Solon Chase, the temporary chairman, said: "I can see that the vote we are going to throw this fall will strike both parties like a streak of chain lightning." The platform declared in favor of "the principles of the national Greenback party; the abolition of all bank issues; the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver; and the issuing by the government of full legal tender paper money, receivable for all debts, public and private, in accordance with existing contracts, and in amounts sufficient to meet the wants of trade." The platform further stated that the Greenback party "intends to restore the country to that purity which is in accordance with the civilization of the 19th century." Joseph L. Smith was nominated for governor.

The Democratic state convention was held in Portland June 18th. It nominated Alonzo Garcelon of Lewiston for governor, and adopted a platform which declared "in favor of the payment of the bonded debt of the United States as rapidly as practicable; opposition to an irredeemable currency, but in favor of the same currency for the government and people, the laborer and office-holder, the pensioner and soldier, the producer and bond-holder."

The state campaign opened early in August. It was a fierce fight from beginning to end. Mr. Dingley took an active part in the fight, speaking nearly every night and writing vigorous editorials. In this campaign James A. Garfield spoke in Lewiston September 2nd. In discussing the evils of irredeemable currency,

Mr. Dingley observed that "in the face of the fact that the fluctuations of prices which have caused the wide-spread commercial disasters are largely due to a depreciated dollar measure, it is surprising that any intelligent man can listen for a moment to the proposal to administer a remedy, increasing permanent doses of the very irredeemable, fluctuating paper money which has caused our troubles. It would be just as sensible for a physician to recommend his delirium tremens patient to drink harder and deeper as a remedy for his difficulties, as for a statesman to recommend more irredeemable paper money to a country suffering from the evils of a fluctuating currency."

In answer to the query of a Greenback correspondent, he wrote: "The Greenbackers build their whole structure on the idea that the greenback is not a promise of the government to pay the value expressed on it in coin (as the sound money men claim); but that it is absolute money itself, just as good and valuable as gold, made so by the government stamp, without any promise or purpose of redemption. Whether the sound money men or soft money men are right in this fundamental principle our correspondent admits he don't pretend to know; yet in the face of this confession, he virtually proceeds to accept the doctrine of an irredeemable currency and found all his complaints on it. This is why the Greenback fallacy deludes so many men who are intelligent on other subjects; they don't stop to consider that this fundamental question of redeemable or irredeemable currency must be first correctly decided before anyone can intelligently decide all other questions of financial policy. * * * The real question which all persons who are inclined to accept Greenback ideas, should first solve to their satisfaction is this: 'Can our paper currency be brought and kept at par without having it redeemable in coin?' No intelligent man can consistently accept any of the Greenback complaints and remedies, until he is prepared to answer in the affirmative and give good reasons for his conclusions."

In discussing currency and business Mr. Dingley wrote: "It is a familiar theory of some of the Greenback papers and speakers, that rising prices are needed to revive business, and that in order to secure this paper money must be issued. This theory rests on the fallacy that the volume of paper money outstanding when the value of each dollar remains unchanged, whether productively used or not, determines prices—a theory which is utterly dissipated by the fact that we have today twice as much paper money per inhabitant as we ever had before the war; while prices, excepting in

a few directions, where machinery and over-production have glutted the market, are about the same as before the war; and that prices are 50 per cent or more lower than from 1868 to 1872, when our paper money was no larger than it has been the past two years. The principle of political economy is that the volume of money actually used, and not the volume outstanding, where each dollar is kept at par, affects prices simply by effecting the demand. In other words, it is demand and supply that regulates exchangeable values.

* * *

"A fluctuation in the value of the dollar measure, however, without any change of the volume of paper money, does directly affect prices, just as any fluctuation in the length of the yard stick would affect the number of yards in a piece of cloth. This is why the paper dollar worth only 70 cents necessarily gave higher prices in 1868, than it does now, when it is worth nearly 100 cents without any change in the volume of paper money. But it should be borne in mind that as shortening or lengthening a yard stick would not increase or decrease the amount of cloth, so increasing or decreasing the value of the greenback dollar does not actually change the real or exchangeable value of any man's property. He may call himself worth more or fewer dollars; but his steers and home and farm are unchanged, and will sell for the same amount of other products. In other words, a general rise of prices caused by a depreciation of the greenback dollar, helps no one except speculators, who purchase on the rise and take care to sell out before the inevitable fall.

"There is no way to increase prices or lessen the burdens of debt by issuing more greenbacks, unless the greenback dollar is to be depreciated. * * *

"What the country wants is a stable currency based on coin, and the stable prices which they give under the operation of supply and demand. Changing prices arising from a fluctuating currency, as Webster so well said, are good for fortunate speculators, but ruinous to the people, as our own experience has shown. Now we have nearly reached this sound currency basis, and passed through the perils of a fluctuating dollar measure, it would be suicide to go back to a depreciated currency and be obliged again to go through greater suffering than ever."

Again he wrote: "The Greenbackers seem to think that because the greenback dollar is a legal tender, it must be accepted by a creditor as a discharge for a dollar's indebtedness where there is no misunderstanding to the contrary, therefore it is

as good as a gold dollar even when it is at a discount as compared with gold. To be sure it will discharge a dollar's old indebtedness even though it may be worth only 75 cents in gold, but it don't prevent a gold dollar at the same time being voluntarily accepted in discharge of \$1.25 of indebtedness, though the law may continue to say that each shall be accepted for a dollar. * * * When the government made its greenback promise a legal tender, it simply said that the creditor should receive the government as a substitute for the private debtor's promise. The debt is not finally paid until the government redeems its promise. It is for this reason that the government cannot finally pay one of its own promises with anything but coin; for an exchange of one kind of government promise for another kind, is not payment. * * * When we come to the purchasing power of the greenback dollar—the chief use to which money is put—then it is received only at its value in coin, without regard to its legal tender qualities. Government never did, and can't compel anybody to sell his products at the same price for depreciated paper as for coin. If the depreciated greenback dollar is called a dollar, then prices quoted in greenbacks advance to make up the depreciation. When greenbacks were worth 50 cents in gold, one could buy twice as much for a gold dollar as for a greenback dollar and pay twice as large a debt. The greenback and the gold dollar are equal in value, that is purchasing power, only when the former is convertible into the latter; and this cannot come until the government is ready, or about ready, to redeem in coin the promise written on the face of the greenback."

In answer to the query "is not the laboring man better off in a country with an irredeemable currency, than in one on a specie basis?" Mr. Dingley replied: "No. The reverse is true, and every political economist of note, and every great statesman so says. The trouble is that the workingman is deceived as to what his real wages are when he is paid in a depreciated currency; and ultimately after a brief period of unhealthy stimulation, industry itself is ship-wrecked. The true measure of wages is the amount of necessities of life they will purchase."

In answer to the question, "what will be gained by resumption of specie payment?" Mr. Dingley wrote: "First, we shall then, and not until then, have a stable currency, every dollar of which will be worth just the same as a gold dollar, and practically unchangeable from month to month. This will prevent the further fluctuations of the greenback dollar, in which prices have been measured, and debts contracted, take away the most prolific cause of our busi-

ness disasters, give us stable prices, inspire confidence in the future, unlock idle capital, gradually revive business, and start up the wheels of industry. Second, the volume of currency will at all times rise and fall with business wants, and take away from demagogues all opportunity to disturb confidence by proposals to remedy the evils of this life by printing more government notes. Gold is acknowledged by every commercial nation to be the most unvarying and reliable standard of value, and all accepted political economists agree that paper money of a sufficient volume for business purposes, cannot be maintained at par with it in any other way than by redemption in coin."

In discussing the bond question, and the proposition raised by the Greenbackers that "bloated bondholders" were being paid in coin, while the soldiers in the field were obliged to receive depreciated currency, he said that "in time of peace the government pays its expenses month by month, with the receipts of taxation. In the struggle for the existence of the nation in the dark days of the war, the government found the current receipts insufficient to maintain its armies in the field, and hence it was obliged to buy and borrow on promises to pay in the future. It issued its promises in two forms—one in greenbacks, payable at no definite time, but understood to be after the war, without interest, having the legal tender or debt paying power (which means simply that a private debt may be discharged by a government promise to pay the amount); and the other the bond, payable at a definite time with interest. Those who furnished supplies or gave their services, were at liberty to take either kind of government promises. But neither greenback nor bond promises of the government to pay dollars will be finally discharged, until they are paid in coin. The fact that both bonds and greenbacks were sold or paid out for less than par in coin, because of the fear that the nation would not be able to pay them, cannot change the obligation of the government to pay according to the understanding, even if the same men now hold both, that originally received them at a discount. But the men and women who now hold these securities,—rarely capitalists and men of large means—have bought them since in the market, generally at higher rate than they now command."

Again he wrote: "A Greenback exchange says 'the country is suffering for want of money, and that government is the only power that can produce it. Let us have more greenbacks and our troubles will cease.'

"Our trouble has largely come from getting off the stable money basis of the commercial world during the war, and attempting to do business with a fluctuating currency which has disturbed prices by first inflating and then correspondingly depreciating them, and unsettled the foundation of business. When we are fairly back to a stable currency and all efforts to disturb it over, then, and not till then,—shall we have a return of confidence and a consequent revival of business."

He observed that "it is surprising that anyone who has had an opportunity to study the science of wealth and the financial history of nations, or to observe our recent history, should adopt the absurd idea that whatever congress declares to be a dollar is a dollar, with the same value as a gold dollar. * * * Value is measured by purchasing power."

The state election was held September 9th, in the midst of great excitement. Governor Connor, the Republican candidate, received 56,554 votes; Alonzo Garcelon, the Democratic candidate, received 28,208 votes; and Joseph L. Smith, the Greenback candidate, received 41,371 votes. There was no choice for governor by the people. Thus closed one of the most remarkable campaigns in the history of the state. For more than a year the Greenback orators and papers had been constantly representing to the people that hard times were caused by the financial policy of the government since 1862 and not by the war and a depreciated currency. Taking advantage of the peculiar state of feeling engendered by financial depression, they had succeeded through a succession of school house meetings, papers, tracts, etc., in convincing thousands of people that resumption of specie payments was the cause of all our trouble, and that happiness, prosperity and industry would be at once revived by dismissing all thought of resumption and issuing a large amount of irredeemable greenbacks, which would in some unexplained manner find their way into every poor man's pocket. At no other time could such ideas have found lodgment in the minds of the people of Maine. The friends of sound money made the mistake of supposing that it was impossible that such Greenback views could make progress, and therefore neglected to present the other side except through a portion of the press, until the campaign opened the first of August. Aside from those leaders caught by this remarkable financial platform, the Greenbackers gathered into their net every element of discontent.

The Republicans hesitated not a moment to take a square and manly ground on the currency question. They refused to cater in

any manner to what they knew was wrong, in order to obtain any present advantage. Notwithstanding hard times had created a strong temporary sentiment in favor of Greenback ideas, yet they risked all in an earnest, manly effort to disabuse the public mind and present sound financial principles. Notwithstanding they had only a short time on the stump to combat the specious inculcations of more than a year, yet the Republicans succeeded in so successfully resisting the greenback tide that it carried over not more than 10,000 Republicans, against nearly three times that number of Democrats. The Democratic party was slowly being swallowed up in the vortex of Greenbackism.

A revision of the count showed that in the legislative vote the Democrats had slid into the Greenback ranks. The senate consisted of 20 Republicans and 11 Greenbackers. The house consisted of 65 Republicans, 61 Greenbackers, 15 sound money Democrats, and 10 fiat money Democrats. The balance of power was therefore in the hands of the 15 sound money Democrats. In this election Congressmen Hale and Powers were defeated by two Greenbackers, George W. Ladd and Thomas Murch. Three Republican congressmen were elected—Thos. B. Reed, William P. Frye, and Stephen D. Lindsey.

Between the state and the November elections the soft money men kept up a continual warfare and made converts throughout the state. Mr. Dingley, however, met them with solid arguments. On one occasion he observed that "honest men who want to act intelligently and wisely should ask themselves if it is safe to assume that the ablest and wisest men of the past five centuries have been all wrong in this matter of a paper currency; and that the men who are leading the greenback movement—Voorhees, Butler, Ewing, Smith, Chase, Fogg, Perry, etc.,—have within five years discovered principles of finance which overturn Adam Smith, John Stewart Mill, Edmund Burke, George Washington, and all the other great men of history." Again he said: "The historic fact stands uncontradicted that there never has been an instance where irredeemable paper, issued in sufficient quantity to transact business has not depreciated."

Benjamin Butler was a candidate for governor of Massachusetts this year, and Mr. Dingley wrote: "For a man with such a record, possessing two millions of property, receiving often \$10,000 for a single law suit, to set himself up as the poor man's friend is the most astounding instance of brass that has ever been known."

The silver question was also occupying the attention of the country and the people of the state of Maine. The Greenback convention of this year had indorsed the proposition to admit silver to free and unlimited coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1. The act of 1873 had been upon the statute book five years, and the agitation in favor of "more money" had set in motion the desire on the part of the financial reformers of the country to coin more silver dollars. The result was the passage of the so-called Bland-Allison act of 1878. In discussing the silver question, Mr. Dingley wrote in June, 1878: "Notwithstanding the claim that the people were ready to take any quantity of silver dollars at par, and that their coinage would at once revive business; yet so far the performance fails to come up with the promise. About six million silver dollars has been coined, but as the government sells them instead of giving them away, nobody wants the dollars of the daddies. Secretary Sherman first offered them at par for gold, but nobody would take them. He then offered them at par in greenbacks, and only enough were taken to use in paying duties, while none went into general circulation. He then changed this programme and tried to get the 'dollar of the daddies' into circulation through the banks, in exchange for greenbacks, but the banks nearly all replied that they don't care for the silver dollars, because their customers object to taking them, preferring bank notes. On the whole the dollar of the daddies has benefited nobody, although when the amount coined is largely increased it may cause some mischief."

Again in September of that year he wrote: "The silver dollar troubles the treasury department. Thirteen millions have been coined and constant attempts have been made to get them into circulation; but four out of five of them have immediately found their way back to the treasury through the custom houses, where they are received instead of gold. In spite of the cry that money is scarce, nobody wants either these millions of dollars, or the hundred millions of greenbacks awaiting purchasers in the United States treasury and other places. Thus far only two millions silver dollars have remained in circulation, and the other ten millions are back in the treasury. The difficulty is that everybody knows that they are really worth but 90 cents, and a dollar which is actually worth ten cents less than a gold dollar, and passes for 100 cents only because there are only a few issued, and the government will give that for it, at the custom houses, necessarily hobbles through the paths of business—especially as everybody sees that as soon as enough of these silver dollars are out to make this kind of

redemption insufficient to maintain them at a higher figure than their real value, they must go down to their actual worth. Payment of them to bondholders would amount to nothing, as they would be returned to the custom houses in 24 hours. Besides, such payment would stop the sale of four per cent bonds. The only chance that the government has to make the silver dollars stay out, is to get them into remote country districts where a longer time will be occupied in getting them back to the treasury.

"P. S. We forgot to say that government does not give away these dollars, but sells them for a greenback or bank dollar!! It may be well to add that if government should print more greenbacks it would simply sell them for 100 cents in coin—just as it is now ready to sell a hundred million of those already printed!!"

Again he wrote: "Notwithstanding large quantities of silver have been purchased by our government and coined into 'dollars of the daddies' yet the market price continues to depreciate. At the present nominal New York rates, the silver in a newly coined dollar is worth about 82 3-4 cents. The mint is continuing, and, under the statutes as they are, must continue to turn out from two to four millions of these coins per month. It would be folly to ignore the fact that under these circumstances the depreciation and disturbance of our currency by the wholly unmanageable element of silver in it, is only a question of time. If congress when it meets, passes a law to stop the further coining of these dollars, it will prevent serious injury to our national currency." He added: "The fluctuation in the value of silver renders it unfitted to be regarded as a standard of value. The suggestion often made that the silver dollar should be made heavy enough to make it worth a gold dollar contains a dangerous fallacy. As long as the value of silver is fluctuating as it has fluctuated during the last three years, no such device would succeed. If for instance, even a year ago, we had begun coining the silver dollar with weight enough to make it equal to gold, it would now be five or six per cent below gold, and we would have to begin over again. There are only two ways out of our difficulty; one is to restrict silver as legal tender to small amounts; the other is to restrict the coinage of it to the amount which experience shows to be called for small change. Nothing is surer than if we go on coining silver at the present rate until enough is afloat for general use, we shall in a year or two lose our gold, as we lost it in 1862, and have silver as our only standard, unless silver rises to 59 or 60 pence per ounce, in the meantime. The thing to be done now, and when congress meets, is to talk of

this fact in the language and frame of mind of business men, without passion or poetry, and deal with it on business principles."

In discussing the functions of money, Mr. Dingley observed: "It is fallacy to suppose money to be the creator or master of business. The truth is exactly the other way. Business is the master of money. Money is but a servant. It flows into circulation at the demand of business, and retires into idleness when business has no further profitable use for it. Contrive to stimulate business into activity, inspire confidence in business men, so that they shall dare risk their capital in business, and thus create employment for more money, and more money will very soon go out in response to the demand." Thus Mr. Dingley early espoused and defended the cause of sound money.

The state constitution provided that in the election of governor "if no person shall have a majority of votes, the house of representatives shall by ballot, from the persons having the four highest number of votes on the list, if so many there may be, elect two persons and make return of their names to the senate, of which the senate shall, by ballot, elect one, which shall be elected governor." The legislature met early in January, 1879. The constitutional candidates selected by the house were Selden Connor, Joseph L. Smith, Alonzo Garcelon, and Frederick Robie. On motion of Mr. Wallace of Belfast, a committee was appointed to receive and count the votes for two candidates for governor to be sent to the senate. The result was declared to be as follows: Smith and Garcelon had 85 votes each, Connor and Robie 64 each. Therefore the names of Smith and Garcelon were sent to the senate. The senate then proceeded to vote upon these two names. The result was Alonzo Garcelon 21, and Joseph L. Smith 10. Thereupon Alonzo Garcelon was declared to be the constitutional governor for the state of Maine for the ensuing year. The Republicans in the senate preferred to vote for Garcelon rather than Smith, because the former was elected on a platform opposed to an irredeemable paper currency.

The health of Mr. Dingley at this time was very poor. His labors on the stump, on the lecture platform and in the editorial chair had drawn upon his vitality to an alarming degree. Late in the spring of 1878, just before the campaign fairly opened, he was taken ill in his office, and carried home in a state of physical collapse. His family and friends were very much alarmed and began to urge upon him the necessity of taking a much-needed rest. Therefore early in October of that year, after the state election was

over, Mr. Dingley with his wife and Dr. Cheney, president of Bates college, sailed for Europe, intending to be absent several months. They left New York on the 5th day of the month, and landed at Glasgow October 15th. Mr. Dingley's fame as a temperance advocate had gone before him, and while stopping at the hotel in Glasgow he was given a reception and dinner. At this dinner he made a speech on the Maine law. From Glasgow he visited other parts of Scotland, was entertained by Sir Wilfred Lawson, and on the 22nd of the month attended the United Kingdom alliance council at Manchester, England, where he spoke in response to the toast "Canada." At Free Trade hall he spoke in the evening to an audience of 8,000 people. From Manchester he journeyed back to Glasgow, then to Edinburgh. Here he visited many historic places including Melrose Abbey, Holyrood Palace, Parliament buildings, and the High Court. On the 31st he was at London, and on the 6th of November crossed the channel and entered France. In Paris ¹ he made a study of French laws and customs, especially its financial system. From France he journeyed through Italy, Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, Germany, Austria, Greece, and Turkey, and spent more or less time in Geneva, Berlin, Vienna, Rome, Florence, Athens, Constantinople, and other places of interest. He spent his last week in Ireland, whence he sailed the middle of May, landing in New York on the 8th of June. Throughout this trip Mr. Dingley wrote interesting and entertaining letters to the Journal, giving in detail his experiences. The letters were quoted freely by the papers of Maine.

June 10th he reached home. He was met at the railroad station by a large number of his fellow-citizens, and a committee appointed at a meeting held the Saturday before. The spokesman of this committee informed Mr. Dingley that it was the wish of the citizens, irrespective of party, to tender him a public reception at City hall. Mr. Dingley expressed his grateful surprise at this token of regard and indicated his readiness to meet all of the people at the appointed time and place. At seven o'clock that evening, June 10th, with the Auburn Light Infantry as escort, Mr. Dingley went

1—Mr. Dingley when at Paris presented his credentials to Mr. R. R. Hitt, of Illinois, secretary of the American legation. Mr. Hitt had gained some reputation as the man who reported stenographically the famous Lincoln-Douglas debates in Illinois, and was subsequently a member of congress from that state, and assistant secretary of state under President Garfield. Mr. Hitt describes Mr. Dingley when he saw him in Paris, as a slight, black-haired, ascetic looking man, exceedingly scholarly and courteous. Mr. Hitt and Mr. Dingley did not meet again until 1881 when they were both members of the lower house of congress. During the American-Spanish war, as chairmen of the ways and means committee and foreign affairs committee in the national house, they became intimate associates and warm personal friends.

to City hall. An audience of 2,500 assembled to welcome him. After music and an address of welcome, Mr. Dingley replied in a speech of three-quarters of an hour giving the conclusions he had reached during his tour concerning the comparative industrial, social and moral advantages of the various states of Europe and the United States, and saying in substance that the United States has the best institutions and the best material prosperity of any nation on earth. The address was frequently interrupted by applause. It is needless to say that he returned from this extended trip in improved health, ready again to take up his journalistic, political and moral work. His success in the past had been great; his promise of future success was greater.

CHAPTER XI.

1879-1880.

The Greenback state convention was held in the city of Portland June 3rd, 1879. It was one of the most remarkable, revolutionary and tumultuous political assemblages ever held in Maine. Prominent Greenbackers were present from all over the state, among them Solon Chase, who seemed to be the favorite for governor. He had a large following among the delegates, and there was a plan formulated to nominate him with a rush. This plan, however, the leaders regarded as revolutionary and not to be tolerated; accordingly the managers of the affair promised Mr. Chase that if he would keep out of the contest for the governorship, he would be sent to the United States senate. His great faith in the coming power of his party inclined him to really believe that this promise could be fulfilled, and he was disposed to step aside. His friends and followers, however, did not take kindly to the proposed shelving of their candidate. The Democrats felt inclined to unite with their Greenback brethren, but after the members of the committee got together they found that the Greenbackers did not wish to unite.

When the convention assembled, Mr. Chase stepped forward to make a motion, and the cry of enthusiasm fairly shook the hall. He was evidently the most popular man in the convention. The platform adopted, reaffirming the principles of the Greenback party of 1878, congratulated the people of Maine upon the reforms inaugurated by the national party and carried forward by the last state legislature of Maine. The platform further endorsed the unlimited coinage of gold and silver to be supplemented by full legal

tender paper money sufficient to transact the business of the country. In the midst of the wildest confusion and charges of fraud, the balloting proceeded. Everybody was mad. For the first time in history, it is said, Solon Chase violated one of the commandments. Finally late in the afternoon Joseph L. Smith was nominated for governor, receiving 851 out of 910 votes, Solon Chase having only 57. Mr. Dingley observed that "the state Greenback convention was a phenomenon well worthy the study of students not only of political but of mental science. No one who has followed the history of greenbackism in Maine and noted the heterogenous elements of which the party is composed, were surprised to learn that for nearly two hours the convention was a mob—utterly unmanageable, utterly unreasonable, in method utterly communistic, and in manner utterly crazy."

The Republican state convention met in the city of Bangor June 26. It was one of the largest Republican state conventions ever held in Maine. The hotels were crowded and among the prominent men present were, Senators Blaine and Hamlin, Congressmen Reed and Lindsey and Former Congressmen Hale and Powers. The Androscoggin delegation met on the evening of the 25th and favored the presentation of the name of Former Governor Dingley, notwithstanding he had steadily declined to allow himself to be considered a candidate. As he was not present, measures were taken to induce him to allow the use of his name, but he positively declined. The resolutions reported and adopted contained the following: "The Republicans of Maine pledge their hearty support to the national administration in its efforts to uphold the financial credit of the government and to insist upon free elections and the right of the United States to enforce its own laws. They believe in honest money for the people, and oppose an irredeemable paper currency as the worst curse that can be inflicted upon a nation. We rejoice that the government's promises to pay are now kept, and that the paper currency of the country is redeemable on demand in coin, so that now the dollar of the laborer is as good as the dollar of the capitalist. We condemn all schemes to tamper with the currency of the people and thereby again unsettle public confidence now happily fast being restored." At the conclusion of a spirited address by Senator Blaine, Daniel F. Davis, on the third ballot, was nominated for governor. Mr. Dingley said that "the Republican state convention was one of the largest, most enthusiastic and harmonious political conventions ever held in Maine."

The Democratic state convention met in Bangor July 1st. The resolutions adopted recited among other things "that we are in favor of a currency of gold, silver and paper, the paper to be kept at par with coin at all times, and are in favor of the free, unlimited coinage of silver." Governor Alonzo Garcelon was re-nominated, but there was a manifest absence of enthusiasm.

The campaign of 1879 was thus launched. Mr. Dingley, with renewed vigor and restored health, entered the contest and labored with voice and pen for the support of the Republican ticket and the principles of sound money. July 24th Secretary John Sherman made an address in Lewiston. Mr. Dingley met him at Portland and escorted him to Lewiston where the distinguished statesman of Ohio was given a rousing reception. From the 5th day of August to the 6th day of September, Mr. Dingley spoke every day. On the night of September 5th, in company with Senator Hamlin, he addressed a large gathering at Winthrop. The same night James A. Garfield spoke in City hall, Lewiston. On the night of September 6th the Republicans of Lewiston had a torchlight parade. Enthusiasm was at a high pitch, all of which augured a Republican victory on the following Monday. Concerning the issues of the campaign Mr. Dingley observed: "Last year thousands of well-meaning men went into the greenback movement because they were made to believe that hard times were caused by the preparations for resumption. They accepted the prediction of the Greenback orators that redemption could not be successfully accomplished, and that to attempt to bring it about, would destroy business, overturn industries, turn men out of employment and bring ruin upon the country. They heard the declaration of Republican speakers and sound money men that resumption could be easily brought about and was necessary to a permanent revival of business—but naturally found it easier in the stress of times to believe prophets of evil than prophets of good. A year has passed since the contradictory theories and predictions were made. The time set for resumption has passed, resumption has been easily brought about, the effects of it have begun to be felt, and every man can judge for himself, whether the Greenback prophets of increased woe and suffering or the Republican prophets of improved times are to be credited. We ask honest, well-meaning men who accepted the Greenback theory last year, to look about themselves and see if they were not deceived. The experience of the last year clearly shows that the soft money movement had no substantial foundation, and is based on an entire misapprehension of financial

principles—in fact ought to lead honest, fair-minded persons who voted the Greenback ticket to revise their views, and give their vote for sound money.”

In discussing the free coinage of silver he wrote: “The proposition to allow the owner of silver bullion to take it to the mints and have it coined free into Bland dollars, is one of the most indefensible discriminations in favor of the owners of one kind of property ever suggested. The government can now buy to any extent the bullion in a silver dollar for eighty-seven and a half cents. So long as the amount is limited to the amount that the people want to buy these silver coins can be sold for one hundred cents. Why then, should not the people of the country, whom the government represents have the profit of twelve and a half cents on every dollar, instead of a few owners of silver bullion? Will anybody give us any reason why Jones’ or Germany’s silver should be thus increased in value by the government? We believe in coining just so many silver dollars for government profit as can be maintained at par with gold; but we are utterly opposed to giving owners of silver mines any of the profits of coining; that belongs to all the people, and not to a rich few. At the same time every man who has studied this subject, well knows, that so long as four hundred and twelve and a half grains of standard silver are worth less than a dollar in gold, the only way by which the government can preserve the equivalency of value, is by carefully limiting the amount outstanding to the actual public demand. The fact that more than half of the silver already coined, have returned to the United States treasury, and stick there, shows that we have already more coined than the people are willing to buy. When silver bullion shall advance so as to be actually the equivalent to gold, it will be time enough to talk about more silver coinage. In the present state of the market, it will be suicide to adopt the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Greenbackers and the Democrats held separate state conventions, there were evidences coming to the surface that a movement toward a coalition had been started. “With two or three exceptions,” wrote Mr. Dingley, “the Democratic and Greenback press of Maine approve the bargain made by the leaders of the two parties for a practical consolidation of their forces. This coalition is proposed in order to secure the spoils of office. If it be true that the principles of the two parties are the same, then not simply the fusion of the organizations on one ticket, but also the union of members of both in one

party would be right and commendable. But the simple fact that this is not squarely attempted, but coalitions are arranged privately on county and legislative tickets, while a show is kept up of supporting separate candidates for governor, is an admission by the leaders that their coalition is not to be defended on principle, but simply a bargain to secure the offices. The Greenback platform called upon the voters of the state to express disapproval of the Republican financial policy, but significantly omits to state whether it is proposed to substitute an irredeemable for a redeemable currency. The design evidently was to leave the matter so indefinite that the platform could be construed either way to suit customers and promote a fusion with the Democrats. The Democratic platform calls on the people of the state to oppose Republicanism, by which is meant Republican ideas respecting reconstruction; and dodges the financial question by declaring that the party favors gold, silver and paper money, without definitely stating whether or not it is to be paper redeemable in coin. It does go the whole length, however, in favor of the most indefensible financial program yet suggested, that is, the free coinage of silver. In such a state of things fusion becomes a mere truck-and-dicker affair for offices without any semblance of principles. Honest Greenbackers as well as sound money Democrats cannot but see that they are being made the tools of leaders who are promoting fusion simply for personal ends."

In answer to a question raised by a correspondent who desired a little light upon the question of the free coinage of silver, Mr. Dingley wrote: "The advantage to the owner of silver bullion is this: He can carry to the mint property that is worth only 87 1-2 cents and have the government perform an operation on it without charge, which, if it makes it the equivalent of a gold dollar, increases its purchasing power or exchangeable value 12 1-2 cents. This is obviously doing for the few owners of silver bullion, what the government will not do for the owners of any other kind of property; and is therefore an unjust discrimination. 'The wrong to the people' evidently lies in giving the profits of coinage of silver to a few owners of silver bullion instead of to the whole people represented by the government. When government does anything which increases the value of bullion, the whole people and not a few silver bullionists should reap the advantage. There has never been a proposition before the American people so unjust and one sided as that of the Democrats and Greenbackers of Maine to have the government coin 87 1-2 cents worth of silver bullion into Bland

silver dollars without charge. Our correspondent is misled by his adoption of the greenback theory that whatever the law declares to be a dollar, whether 412 1-2 grains of silver, or a piece of paper with a greenback, is thereby made the equivalent of a dollar in coin without redemption. If this theory be true, we ask our correspondent why silver that costs 87 1-2 cents should be used up in making a dollar, when paper and lamp-black that cost scarcely two mills will make just as good a dollar? And if this fiat money theory be true, why should the government give silver mine owners the 12 1-2 per cent profit of silver coinage, when it may secure not only the same profit, but also (by using paper) nearly 100 per cent profit for the whole people? A little reflection ought to show honest Greenbackers that they are seriously mistaken in their theory of money. Calling a piece of paper a dollar by law does not make it a dollar equivalent to gold, unless somebody will give gold for it; and certainly nobody will unless the government that issued it stands ready to do it. When our Greenback friends dismiss this 'fiat moonshine,' and look at money as one kind of wealth, which can be obtained as other forms of wealth are, viz: by purchase or theft—then all the delusion and complaint which hang on the theory that government can make money without it costing anything, will at once be dispelled."

In this memorable campaign Solon Chase used with great effect his appeal relative to the depreciation of the value of "them steers." In reply to this homely, but effective argument, Mr. Dingley said that "the steer argument looks very plausible to men who float on the surface of the currency question, but has no foundation the moment we understand its whole bearing. The complaint is made that the prices of steers and all other property have declined, so that we find today that we are not worth so many dollars as we suppose. Of course the appreciation of the greenback dollar from 50 and 70 cents has changed the price of everything, but it has not taken away any of our property. Our steers and other product, as a whole, will purchase more of everything farmers want than they would before the war, and full as much as they would at any period in the flush times. Estimated in greenback dollars, steers have depreciated, because greenback dollars have been brought up to par, as everybody said they ought to be; but estimated in the articles which a farmer wants, steers will buy more than before the war, and as much even as in flush times. Wool will buy much more of the necessities of life than ever before, and potatoes twice as much as before the war. The farmer very clearly has a deep in-

terest in a redeemable currency, worth as much as gold; and the men who are trying to get him to vote to overthrow resumption and go back to an irredeemable and therefore depreciated and fluctuating currency, are his worst enemies."

The fight between the soft and the hard money men of Maine was thus fierce and bitter; but Mr. Dingley, by his courtesy, fair treatment and serious consideration of the arguments presented by the soft money men, wielded tremendous influence among the voters of the state. Among the notable Republican speakers in the campaign were, the candidate for governor, Daniel L. Davis, Congressmen Frye and Reed, Senator Blaine and Former Congressman Hale, Zachariah Chandler of Michigan, John D. Long of Massachusetts and William McKinley Jr., of Ohio. The columns of the *Journal* throughout this campaign were filled with lucid and sound arguments against the free coinage of silver and the issue of irredeemable money. The facts in the history of all nations were clearly brought forth and the fallacy of the soft money men exposed to the light of day. The arguments presented were unanswerable. They were all prepared and written by Mr. Dingley who clearly showed himself not only a master of the subject but the best posted man on financial matters in the state of Maine, with the possible exception of Mr. Blaine. In this campaign the *Journal* was a tremendous power, and its articles tearing the mask from the fallacies of the fusion forces, were a powerful factor in stemming the tide of fiat money and saving the state from even a worse disaster than that which befell it in 1880.

Although the Democrats and Greenbackers in this campaign nominated separate candidates for governor, nevertheless they practically united in nominating and supporting fusion candidates for nearly all the subordinate offices in the state, and in the various counties and towns. The election was held September 8th. Daniel F. Davis received 68,967 votes, Joseph L. Smith 47,643 votes and Alonzo Garcelon 21,851 votes. On the face of the returns the Republicans carried both houses of the state legislature. Of the result Mr. Dingley wrote: "We congratulate the Republicans of Maine on their grand victory. It has been a hard fought contest. We have had opposed to us not one organization with clearly defined principles, but two with antagonistic principles. Circumstances have favored their fusion for the time, but it will be impossible for them to repeat it under so favorable circumstances. Next year there can be no dodging of the national issue, and all voters will be called upon to choose between the Republican and

Democratic candidates for president. Then it will be impossible for Greenbackers to fuse, and the square question on national issues will inevitably compel Greenbackers to choose between Republican and Democratic rule." Among those elected to the state house of representatives, were the following prominent Republicans: Former Congressman Hale, Former State Treasurer Hatch, Former Senators Mason and Brooks, Former Mayor Butler and A. A. Strout Esq.

Maine greenbackism was three years old. It started at Chase's Mills, in the campaign of 1876. In 1877 the Greenback vote was about 5,000; in 1878 it was 47,000; this year, 1879, it was 47,643. Of the future of the party Mr. Dingley observed, a week after the state election: "Undoubtedly the Greenback party in Maine will maintain its organization until next year. But it is evident it has received a mortal stab here, and in order to play any part in the national campaign next year, it will be obliged to practically concede that the first idea which called it into being, has been dispelled by the stern logic of events. This however, is a confession that the mission of Greenbackism is ended; for when resumption and a redeemable currency is acceptable as an irrevocable fact,—as it must be—the financial question is settled."

The state machinery was in the hands of the Democrats; ¹ and about the middle of November there were rumors afloat of an attempt on the part of the fusion leaders, to have the Republican majority in the senate and house counted out by the governor and council. The Republican leaders became alarmed. Eben F. Pillsbury and other prominent Democrats had openly made the boast that the fusionists would, after all, have the legislature, and that Mr. Davis would not be governor. It was supposed however that these were mere idle threats; but about the 20th of November enough was known to warn the Republicans to keep a close watch on the proceedings at the capital between that date and the meeting of the state legislature. The reports of the intentions of the council were so unsatisfactory to the leading Republicans, that Senator Blaine, chairman of the Republican state committee, requested the members of the committee and other Republicans to meet him at his home in Augusta. Accordingly on November 17th, a large number of Republicans assembled at Augusta. Among them were Senator Hamlin, Congressmen Reed and Lindsey, Former Governors A. P. and L. M. Morrill, Washburn, Perham, Coburn and

¹—Alonso Garcelon was governor, and the following were members of the council: John B. Foster, Halsey H. Monroe, Charles H. Chase, Simon S. Brown, Frederick G. Parker, Edward C. Moody, and Frank M. Fogg.

Dingley, and several state senators and representatives-elect. After consultation a committee was appointed to ascertain of the governor and council whether the returns had been opened; when senators and representatives elect could have an opportunity to inspect them; for how long a time corrections would be received under the statute; and such other information as would shed light on the situation. Mr. Dingley was chairman of this committee appointed to wait on Governor Garcelon. On reaching the state house the chairman of the committee waited on the governor who expressed some indignation because of the stories afloat respecting the counting of the returns, and also because of the gathering of Republicans at Augusta, and stated that the council would not be in session for some time.

Ascertaining that the governor would furnish to the committee whatever he possessed, Mr. Dingley, Congressman Lindsey and Former Attorney General Emery were deputed to confer with Governor Garcelon for that purpose. The result was that the governor informed the committee that the returns were on the 30th of October placed in the hands of a sub-committee of the council consisting of Messrs. Moody, Chase, Fogg, Foster and Brown, to be opened and tabulated; that they would be open to public inspection when the committee met and reported; that twenty days thereafter would be allowed for corrections under the statute and for any hearings that might be desired; and that everything should be done fairly and openly, and according to law. It was decided to have gentlemen interested inspect the returns for each county, to see what corrections were needed. Accordingly Mr. Dingley, on behalf of the Republican candidates of Androscoggin county, applied to the secretary of state for permission to examine the returns for that county, and the secretary replied that the returns were not in his hands, but in the custody of the committee of the council. He then applied to the council in session, and was told by the chairman that they would not then hear him, but if he would file a request in writing they would take it up in regular order. Hon. Thomas B. Reed remained in the city as advisory counsel, and the Republicans assembled at the capital chose the following committee to act as an advisory board during the crisis. Lewis Barker, of Bangor; Nelson Dingley Jr., of Lewiston; Selden Connor, of Augusta; Frederick A. Pike, of Calais; L. A. Emery, of Ellsworth; and A. A. Strout, of Portland.


November 30th the situation at Augusta suddenly and unexpectedly changed, and there was grave reason to fear the worst.

In answer to urgent summons from Mr. Blaine and others, Mr. Dingley again went to Augusta. Governor Garcelon and council refused to allow the inspection and correction of legislative returns, but charged mistakes and fraud which they claimed justified the counting out of several Republican members of both houses. Protests from Republican senators and representatives were sent to the governor and council. There was intense interest in the canvassing proceedings, and the situation became strained. Nobody outside of a few fusion leaders knew what the governor and council proposed to do. It was finally decided to apply to Judge Virgin, holding court at Fryburg,—the only court in session—for a mandamus to the secretary of state to allow candidates and their counsel a reasonable inspection of returns. The senate chamber, in which the hearing was held, was crowded, and after the petition was read, Secretary of State Gove made answer that since October 30th, when he transferred the returns to the governor and council, he had not been the legal custodian of the returns.


At this juncture the position taken by the governor and council strengthened the suspicion of Republicans that the fusion returns had been secretly and surreptitiously "set in order" at critical points, while Republican returns were not to be corrected. From evidence obtained in Washington county, a letter was addressed to the governor and council making the serious charge distinctly, that the returns had been tampered with. The governor and council paid no attention to this letter. Petitions numerously signed, and bearing the names of Democrats and Greenbackers, poured in, asking the governor and council to investigate. One came from Lewiston and Auburn signed by Mr. Dingley and a number of citizens, including Greenbackers. Mr. Dingley said that "the action of the majority of the council in denying access to the returns by parties directly interested, after those returns had been declared open and the 20 days allowed by statute for correction had begun to run—is a flagrant violation of the plain intent of the law, and the established practice of the state authorities of half a century.

* * * It cannot be that the people of Maine of any political party, will look otherwise than with astonishment and indignation on the course of the council in this matter."

In conversation with Mr. Dingley, Governor Garcelon indignantly denied that the returns had been tampered with; but admitted that he did not see them until some time after they had all been opened by the secretary of state or committee of the council.



JOSHUA L. CHAMBERLAIN. DANIEL F. DAVIS.
ALONZO GRACELON.
SELDEN CONNOR. H. M. PLAISTED



It seemed strange, therefore, in the face of the serious charges made, that Governor Garcelon did not order an investigation.

It was quite evident that the leading fusionists were using Governor Garcelon. They persuaded him that he was being insulted and abused by the Republicans who asked to see the returns. He was styled a "second Jackson;" and in deliberately setting aside the law of 1877 which allowed 20 days for a correction of the returns, he was made to believe that he was walking in the footsteps of the "hero of New Orleans." There was intense feeling all over the state, delegations arriving almost daily at the capital. The Republicans looked upon the program as a deliberate attempt to change the result of the vote of the people, and denounced it as an outrage never before paralleled in a civilized and orderly state. Mr. Dingley said that "the men who are trying to change the verdict of the people by taking advantage of technical informalities, will find that their game of scanning the Republican side and winking at their own, will not work. * * * It would be a great injustice to our people, an irreparable wrong to our state, and a serious damage to free institutions, for the governor and council in canvassing votes, to overrun the decision of the people at the polls and make the result of our election depend on the whims of the canvassers. Let us hope that the final step which is threatened by so many fusion leaders, will not be taken; and that our state will be spared the disgrace of such a wrong."

To show the desperate character and the reckless nature of the conspirators, the Greenback Chronicle of December 5th, said: "Perhaps Messrs. Baker & Baker are not aware that if the judges of the supreme court have issued a mandamus against the governor and council, that body would have taken no more notice of it than a mandamus issued by seven jackasses in Australia. The supreme court is a very august body, but it has no more power over the governor than the ghost of Solomon."

In this mandamus case, to compel the secretary of state to show the returns, Judge Virgin rendered a decision that the law and the constitution gave the right of inspection, but the court could not issue a mandamus to the executive department, when the secretary of state said they had the returns for the purpose of canvassing. As the governor and council had opened the returns for inspection on the day of the hearing the object of the application to the court was accomplished.

The great outrage was consummated finally on the 17th of December. The governor and council counted out a Republican ma-

majority of 7 in the senate and 29 in the house; and substituted a senate containing 11 Republicans and 20 Fusionists, giving a fusion majority of 9; and a house having 78 Fusionists, 61 Republicans and 12 vacancies, giving a fusion majority of 17. Cities which elected 12 Republicans were deprived of any representation, and 16 towns or districts which elected Republican representatives, had the men whom they chose unseated, and 15 fusionists substituted. In other words 28 Republican representatives and 8 senators were counted out, and not a single fusionist failed to get his certificate. The extent of the outrage astonished everybody. Law and justice had been set aside at every step. "Fatal technicalities" had been found only in the case of Republicans manifestly elected. Mr. Dingley commented thus: "It has been the proud boast of Maine and of every northern state, heretofore, that the beaten party has gracefully accepted the result and united to carry out the people's will. No longer than last year, when the Republicans held the state government, had a majority of senators-elect, and lacked only 12 members of a majority in the house, there was not a Republican in the state so lost to all sense of justice as to entertain for a moment the thought of retaining power by taking advantage of defects in returns. Now, for the first time, the fusion governor and council of Maine have actually changed the result of an election, not only by taking advantage of technical defects in Republican returns, but also by illegally refusing to allow their corrections under a law of the state, even declining to investigate charges that fusion returns have been surreptitiously corrected. More than that, the law as interpreted by the supreme court has been squarely violated in order to secure a majority of the whole house. The astonishing fact that returns electing 28 Republican representatives, have been declared defective, while every fusion return is held to be strictly according to law, is sufficient of itself to satisfy every candid man that there has been a surreptitious correction of fusion returns, while Republicans are refused permission to correct returns even where the law provides for this. * * * This outrage is not simply a wrong committed against the party which prevailed in the late election. It is a wrong to every citizen who loves our institutions, and who knows that their preservation depends on the maintenance of such a regard for the people's will as expressed at an election, as will lead the minority to at once yield to it, and obey it. To deliberately overthrow such an expression of the people, in a peaceable, law-abiding state, is to strike a blow at Republican institutions. Such blows are much more to be feared than the open

blows of rebel armies; for then they invite a repetition of them and go far towards introducing anarchy. * * * The crisis is an extraordinary one. It is not simply a question of party supremacy, but a question of submission to the popular will which has to do with the preservation of free government. Unless this outrage on the right of suffrage and representation is condemned promptly and emphatically, it will go far to Mexicanize the United States, and introduce a principle which will surely eventually overturn government by the people. When the clear, unquestioned verdict of the people at the polls can be successfully overturned in defiance of law by the governor and council, popular elections become a farce. * * * The appropriate tribunal to settle the great question raised, is, of course the supreme court. It was the duty of the governor and council to ask the court to give an opinion on matters of so momentous interest involving so important constitutional questions. They refused to do this; they now say, with some show of law, that there is no way for the 28 Republicans counted out of the legislature to appeal to the court in season to avert the organization of the legislature they have created. Whether or not this is so, it must be that some way can be devised—after the meeting of the legislature if not before—to have the supreme court decide the grave constitutional question which they alone are competent to settle. We should deprecate a resort to violence, but nothing short of that which can by indirection put the case before the court, should be omitted. That is the only body competent to settle the controversy, and possibly avert grave results.”

Throughout this crisis Mr. Dingley was one of the chief advisors of the Republicans. He conferred with Judge C. W. Walton, a member of the supreme court, relative to the legal and constitutional points involved. He was determined to fight the matter to the end; and on the 16th of December, the day before the governor and council announced a consummation of their outrage, went to Augusta to hold a conference with Mr. Blaine. There was intense excitement in the city, many Republicans urging the immediate adoption of force. But Mr. Dingley advised more peaceful means. He felt sure that the governor and council would be forced to surrender to public sentiment and a decision of the supreme court of the state on the important points involved. At this conference the situation was carefully reviewed, and at Mr. Dingley's suggestion a meeting of leading Republicans was arranged for the 22nd of December. On that day the Republican state committee and prominent Republicans from various parts of the state,

met at Senator Blaine's residence in Augusta. The action of the governor and council was discussed and the following committee appointed to devise and co-operate with the Republican members of the legislature: Hon. Lot M. Morrill, Hon. Nelson Dingley Jr., Col. F. E. Heath, Col. J. W. Spaulding, Capt. C. A. Boutelle, Col. J. T. Richards, Alden Sprague. Among other Republicans present were Senators Hamlin and Blaine, Former Governor Connor, and Congressman Reed. The meeting was unanimously in favor of resisting the outrage at every step with all appropriate means that could be devised; and there was a decided conviction that in the end the conspirators would go to the wall, and the usurpation receive condemnation and final burial.

Governor Garcelon made a public statement, in which he solemnly assured the public that he had aimed to follow the constitution and the laws and that the great cry about conspiracy and fraud arose from the fact that "he had taken the constitution for his guide, fortified by the opinions of the supreme court of the state and the advice of many legal gentlemen," and that "he had left the whole matter to the action of the legislature where it properly belonged." In answer to this memorials were sent to the governor requesting him to ask the opinion of the supreme court as to the legality and constitutionality of his action in each of the cases in which he had counted out Republicans. Indignation meetings were held in the principal cities of the state. The halls were packed to suffocation, and the feeling was more intense than had been known since the civil war. At Augusta, on one of the coldest nights of the winter, there gathered in Granite hall such a crowd of people as was seldom seen there. Former Governor Connor presided and resolutions declaring that "Governor Garcelon and his seven executive councilors had forfeited the confidence and earned the condemnation of the people," were adopted. Senator Blaine made a speech of considerable length wherein he reviewed the situation, closing with this appeal which was applauded to the echo: "A great popular uprising will avert these evils and restore honest government in Maine—and the people are already moving." On the night of December 26th, the citizens of Androscoggin county assembled in City hall to enter their protest against the outrage which was being perpetrated. Mr. Dingley was the first and leading speaker. He made a clear and able presentation of the case and discussed the following points: (1)—It is believed the fusion returns at vital points were surreptitiously corrected. (2)—The wholesale counting out shows that the law was twisted with a view of thwarting

rather than carrying out the verdict at the polls. (3)—The governor and council conducted their canvass with the apparent purpose of counting out Republicans and counting in fusionists. (4)—Republicans have been counted out on alleged defects, and fusionists counted in, where the same defects existed in their returns. (5)—A large proportion of the defects under which Republicans have been counted out were amendable under the constitution, without regard to the statute. (6)—Republican returns entirely correct were counted out, on various pretexts, in defiance of the law.

Hon. Lot. M. Morrill, chairman of the advisory committee, wrote a note to Governor Garcelon requesting him to ask the opinion of the court on the questions at issue. He did this under instructions from the advisory committee. Several days later the governor made public this correspondence, and replied giving some encouragement. Two days later Mr. Morrill forwarded to the governor the questions the committee wanted put to the court; but the governor, doubtless at the request of the council, decided not to submit these questions. Finally the pressure on the governor was so strong that he consented to present some questions of his own to the court. These questions were forwarded to Chief Justice Appleton on the last day of December, but were not then made public.

The situation became still more alarming when information reached Augusta that the arms and ammunition in the state arsenal at Bangor, were about to be removed to the state house at Augusta, and that the state house was to be converted into a fortress, to prevent the counted-out Republicans from entering to claim their seats. A thousand or more excited people gathered in the streets, and when the teams with the warlike material appeared, they demanded of the driver by what authority he was removing this property. It was answered that the governor had ordered their removal. The crowd required the teamster to take the arms back to the arsenal. The mayor and other citizens immediately wrote the governor requesting him not to unnecessarily arouse an excited populace by displaying warlike material. The governor finally sent the adjutant general to Bangor to remove the arms, and as the teams proceeded to the station, the bells tolled and a crowd gathered; but there was no interference. The arms arrived at Augusta late at night and were moved to the state house, a large crowd of people following.

A committee on the public safety of Augusta called upon the governor and informed him that they represented the people of the

city, and would cordially join with the mayor in preserving order. They hoped that no arrangement would be made to bring the military to Augusta, whereupon the governor replied emphatically: "I have force enough now."

As the time for the assembling of what was known as the Pilsbury or "counted-in" legislature, which was called to meet in Augusta January 3rd, drew near, the excitement and uneasiness increased. The fusionists were somewhat alarmed lest they might not hold the house. Of the senate they felt sure. The returns were under lock and key, and the council refused to allow them to be seen. Already 40,000 rounds of ammunition had been stored in the state house, and there was promise of a lively time. The fusion leaders enrolled men to be used in case of necessity. The whole state waited breathlessly for the impending conflict.

On the 3rd day of January, 1880, the state supreme court made public its answers to the questions propounded by Governor Garcelon. These questions all pertained to the power of the governor and council relative to the canvassing of returns. The replies of the court showed conclusively that every one of the counted-out Republicans had been illegally set aside. The court delivered this rebuke to the governor and council: "This government rests upon the great constitutional axiom, that all power is inherent in the people. It is a government of the people, by the people and for the people, and, if administered in the spirit of its founders, it shall not perish from the earth. Its constitution was formed, to use the apt expression of one whose memory is embalmed in the hearts of his countrymen, 'by plain people' and plain people must administer it. The ballot is the pride as well as the protection of all. It is the truest indication of the popular will. The official returns required from the municipal officers of the several plantations, towns and cities, are, and will be, made by plain people, and made, too, in the hurry and bustle and excitement of an election. They are not required to be written with the scrupulous nicety of a writing master, or with the technical accuracy of a plea in abatement. The sentences may be ungrammatical, the spelling may deviate from the recognized standard, but returns are not to be set at naught because the penmanship may be poor, the language ungrammatical or the spelling erroneous. It is enough if the returns can be understood; and if understood, full effect should be given to their natural and obvious meaning. They are not to be strangled by idle technicalities, nor is their meaning to be distorted by carping and captious criticism. When the meaning is ascer-

tained there should be no hesitation in giving it full effect." This decision was signed by every member of the supreme court: John Appleton, Chas W. Walton, William G. Barrows, Chas. Danforth, John A. Peters, Artemus Libbey, and Joseph W. Symonds.

For a day or two this opinion seemed to stun the conspirators, but they finally managed to induce all but three of the fusionists to defy the opinion of the court. These three realized that this decision completely sustained the interpretation of the constitution and the laws previously given by sober-minded men of all parties. After several conferences the conspirators rallied their forces and denounced the unanimous decision of the court as partisan, and decided to carry out their plans at all hazards. There was much incendiary talk; and some insane fusionists made an attempt to burn Senator Blaine's premises by the use of a fuse. Governor Garcelon was for some time fearful of his life, threatening letters having been sent to him. He wrote a personal letter to Major General Chamberlain urging the latter in language more emphatic than choice, to come to Augusta at once. In obedience to orders¹ following this private communication, General Chamberlain as military commander of the militia of the state, at once repaired to the

I. The attention of all military organizations now in the service of the state and of all men liable to military duty in this state, is directed to the following orders:

State of Maine,
Adjutant General's Office,
Augusta, Jan. 5, 1880.

General orders No. 12. I. The general counties of this state are constituted into the first division of the militia of Maine.

II. Major General Joshua L. Chamberlain is assigned to the command of the first division.

III. The commanding officers of military organizations accepted into the service of the state are required to report to him.

He will be obeyed and respected accordingly.

By order of the Governor and Commander-in-Chief,
S. D. Leavitt, Adjt.-Gen.
State of Maine,
Adjutant General's Office,
Augusta, Jan. 5, 1880.

Special orders No. 45. Major General Joshua L. Chamberlain is hereby authorized and directed to protect the public property and institutions of the state until my successor is duly qualified.

(Signed)

Alonso Garcelon, Gov.

I am now discharging the duties thus involved on me in protecting the public property and institutions of the state until a governor is legally elected and duly qualified.

Particular attention is called to the law rendering it unlawful for any body of men other than the regularly organized corps of the militia, without authority expressly given, to associate themselves together as a military company, or organization, or to parade in public with arms.

All persons and organizations will take notice accordingly and all authorized military organizations will understand that they are to report to me for orders until they are otherwise ordered by or through me.

Joshua L. Chamberlain, Maj. Gen.

Frank E. Nye, Maj. and A. A. G.

state capital. He found the building barricaded with heavy planks, and arms and ammunition in evidence.

"This is not an arsenal," said Gen. Chamberlain to the governor, "and yet you have one hundred and twenty or thirty fellows about here armed as if for a fight. I don't like the looks of these men."

The governor had sworn these men in as a special body guard. Said he to the General: "I swore these in because of threatened insurrection."

"But," replied the General, "if there is any bloodshed, governor, you are in danger of landing in jail. These men are disturbing the peace and you will be held responsible for their acts."

"But these Republicans threaten to take possession of this house and senate," argued the governor.

"That would not be so disastrous as bloodshed," replied the general. "We have no right to keep these armed ruffians here, and I will not remain if they are not sent away in half an hour."

The governor's armed body guard was immediately dismissed, and at midnight the Bangor arms were sent away, General Chamberlain taking the precaution to notify the authorities at every station to see that there was no interference. The mayor of the city placed one hundred and fifty policemen at his command, and the general wrote a letter to Mr. Blaine, counseling no violence.

On the night before the assembling of the fusion legislature, the Republicans held a caucus to consider the situation. The Republican members of the house and senate together with the members of the advisory committee were present, and behind closed doors they laid their plans for the following day. At this conference Mr. Dingley made a vigorous address, urging the Republicans to resist the conspiracy at every step. He said he was confident that the leaders of the affair would soon be obliged to yield to the inevitable influence of public sentiment.

The day of the assembling of the fusion legislature arrived. The crowd at the capitol was immense, but there was no riotous disturbance. Throughout this profound excitement, Mr. Dingley and the other members of the advisory committee were in attendance, giving advice to the Republican members of the house and senate. The fusionists organized the senate against the protests of the Republicans, choosing Mr. Lamson president. The house was organized by 72 fusionists. The Republicans withdrew, no quorum voting. Mr. Hale was the leader of the Republicans in the house who refused to participate in the revolutionary proceedings of the fus-

ionists. In the midst of intense excitement and great uproar, Mr. Hale moved that the house adjourn, claiming that there was no quorum. The clerk refused to put Mr. Hale's motion, whereupon Mr. Hale put it himself, and declared it carried. Immediately every Republican member retired from the hall, no legal house being in session. As soon as order was restored the remaining fusion members sent a message to the governor and council, stating that a quorum of members of the house was present and ready to be qualified. This announcement created further excitement throughout the capitol. The governor and council appeared and proceeded to qualify the members. The governor declared that 76 members constituted a quorum, and that the required number had taken and subscribed to the necessary oath. This announcement was received with the wildest uproar by the fusion contingent, which was fairly beside itself with hilarity. The governor then said: "I now put into your hands the opinion of the supreme court, as well as the petition of gentlemen from certain cities claiming seats. I invoke your careful consideration of the same." No sooner had the governor ceased than an ardent friend cried out: "Three cheers for Governor Garcelon," and the fusion hero was given a round of hearty cheers, accompanied, however, by prolonged hisses from the indignant counted-out members. The house then proceeded to organize by the election of Joshua C. Talbot, speaker, by a vote of 72, four less than a quorum. Mr. Hale objected but was overruled, and the proceedings continued. Mr. Hale stood his ground alone, maintaining that there had been no legal organization of the house.

The term of office of Governor Garcelon had expired, and in this crisis the state had no governor. On the Friday following, (Jan. 12) General Chamberlain, acting under the order issued by Governor Garcelon before he retired, assumed supreme control as acting governor and commander-in-chief. He had the archives of the state locked up and took the keys, and placed a guard over the public property. The action of Gen. Chamberlain coming to the ears of President Lamson of the senate, that gentleman waited upon Gen. Chamberlain. "General," said Mr. Lamson, "my people demand that I shall ask you to recognize me as governor, and to turn over the state government to me. If you don't I'm afraid somebody will kill me."

"Mr. Lamson," said the General, "while it is true your election as president of the senate gives you some color of authority, I cannot turn the government over to you until I have some higher opin-

ion than I have thus far received. Will you abide by a decision of the supreme court?"

"Yes, I will," replied Mr. Lamson.

General Chamberlain was in a critical position. Notwithstanding the fact that a judge of the supreme court had privately told him that Mr. Lamson was the rightful governor of the state, nevertheless the general refused to surrender to Lamson, because he said "he was bound to take notice of the fact that it was generally conceded a Republican majority had been elected to the state legislature."

"Considering the doubtful legal character of the legislature," said General Chamberlain, "I cannot recognize Mr. Lamson as acting governor."

There was no state government. The terms of office of the state officials had expired, and the doors of the departments were closed. No money was received or paid out, General Chamberlain realizing that his military authority would not permit him to perform the functions belonging to civil authority. Under the orders received from Governor Garcelon, General Chamberlain was to protect the property of the state and preserve peace, "until a legal government was organized." Gen. Chamberlain forthwith dismissing all unauthorized persons hanging about the state house, summoned Gen. John Marshall Brown, and Gen. Spaulding, to aid him. The mayor of the city also put under Gen. Chamberlain's charge a squad of police. A guard was detailed to protect the state treasury, and Gen. Chamberlain notified the public that he should maintain order and protect property. The state was thus under martial law.

The reply of General Chamberlain to the communication of James B. Lamson as to whether Gen. Chamberlain was prepared to recognize the authority of the said Lamson as governor, is a notable document worth quoting in full. He said: "In the attitude which things have now taken, the responsibility resting on me under this order, involves the liberties of the people, their most sacred property, and the stability of constitutional government, their highest institution. I am thankful that you feel and understand this, and realize equally with myself the importance of our proceeding with caution. Your inquiry virtually calls upon me to decide a question of constitutional law, which is a matter falling not at all within the province of my department. In my military capacity I have not the privilege of submitting such questions to the only tribunal to decide them. The constitution declares that justices of the supreme court shall be obliged to give their opinion upon im-

portant questions of law and upon solemn occasions when required by the civil branch of the government, but that privilege is not accorded to the military department. Supported by the decision of the court, I shall obey, without a moment's hesitation, but solemnly believing if at this juncture I abandon my trust, there will be no barrier against anarchy and bloodshed, I cannot under the present circumstances recognize your authority as governor of Maine. There are only two ways to settle the question at issue and quiet the public minds, by following strictly the constitution and laws or by revolution and blood. In this alternative and standing where I must be judged by God and man, I can only hold fast in my place and implore those who have the power to decide the questions by appeal to the peaceful course of the law. Believing that this answer must commend itself to your judgment as the only one possible for me to give, and with the highest respect and esteem, I have the honor of being, your obedient servant,

"J. L. Chamberlain,
"Major General."

A fusion committee waited on General Chamberlain to inquire if he would recognize a governor if the legislature should elect one. The General replied: "No sir, I will not. I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that a Republican legislature was elected. I cannot pre-judge this matter by recognizing anybody until the courts settle it. I am prepared to do what is necessary to carry out this plan. I shall resist force with force."

Every military company in the state had been ordered to obey nobody but General Chamberlain, and the railroads were at his command.

Some of the members of the Republican advisory committee were in favor of the use of force. Mr. Blaine was among them; and he was somewhat out of patience with Gen. Chamberlain because the latter did not use force at the outset. Thomas W. Hyde was sent by Mr. Blaine to Gen. Chamberlain to inform the latter that the Republican leaders had decided to "pitch the fusionists out of the window."

"Tom," said Gen. Chamberlain, "you are as dear to me as my own son. But I will permit you to do nothing of the kind. I am going to preserve the peace. There is to be no fighting. I want you and Mr. Blaine and the others to keep away from this building."

Joseph R. Bodwell appeared at the capitol one day with fifty men armed with pistols; but Gen. Chamberlain begged them all to retire at once, which they did.

On the evening of January 12th the Republican members of the senate and house of representatives proceeded to the state house for the purpose of organizing a legislature. The movement was entirely unknown to the fusionists, and but few of the Republicans outside of the immediate members were aware of the state of affairs. The report that the Republicans had taken possession of the state house spread rapidly and caused great rejoicing among those who were impatient to have the matter brought to a head. The galleries of the hall were filled with an enthusiastic crowd and many more were upon the floors. The best of order prevailed; but before the business began, throngs of people besieged the hallways, doors and galleries. This movement to start a second legislature was decided upon after a conference between Mr. Dingley and Judge Walton of the state supreme court. Two plans of operation had been suggested—one was to have the Republican members qualify before a justice of the peace, and then ask recognition of General Chamberlain; but this plan was objected to as asking the general to exercise judicial powers. At a private caucus of Republicans, this objection was pointed out by Mr. Dingley, and it was finally decided to organize a separate legislature and ask the courts to settle the question of legality.

A request for the use of the legislative halls for that evening was made of Gen. Chamberlain in writing. The latter immediately issued a written order granting the privilege. This action soon became known to the fusionists in and about the capitol, and there were many threats and mutterings. The mob moved into the capital building when the door of General Chamberlain's private office was suddenly opened. There stood Adjutant General Brown as white as a sheet.

"General," he cried, "you're lost. A mob is outside threatening the building."

"What do you mean?" inquired the general.

"There is an angry mob outside. Are there any arms here?" And he snatched an old musket that was hanging on the wall.

Without a moment's hesitation Gen. Chamberlain, who was no stranger to real war, walked out into the corridor and mounted the stairs. He said: "I understand you want to see me, my men. Have you any grievance?"

He faced an excited mob, many armed with pistols. But not a word was uttered. Again General Chamberlain inquired: "If any man has a grievance let him speak."

Finally one man spoke up and said: "We are told, General, you are going to prevent justice by allowing the Republicans to organize and then turn the state government over to them."

The General said: "I am here to preserve the peace, and I will do it at all hazards. All will have full justice."

One ruffian cried out: "Well, we're goin' to kill you!"

The civil war veteran unbuttoned his coat, and without a tremor in his voice, said: "I have faced the enemy before, and I have no fear now. Do your worst!"

There was breathless silence for a moment. The scene was dramatic in the extreme. Finally the leader of the mob said: "By G—, the man who lifts a hand against you, General, is a dead one!"

The terrible strain was relieved and the general said quietly: "I pledge you I will not destroy the peace of your state, but I want you all to leave the state house." And they did, but not without much muttering.

The members in the senate chamber were called to order by Hon. Jeremiah Dingley Jr., an uncle of Mr. Dingley. A quorum was announced present, and all proceeded to qualify. Joseph A. Locke was chosen president. The Republican members of the other house assembled in the hall of representatives and were called to order by Hon. Eugene Hale. Eighty-four answered to their names, and these, with others who came in later, were duly qualified. Resolutions were adopted in both houses for the appointment of a committee to report whether the newly organized legislature will require the justices of the supreme judicial court to give their opinion touching the legal organization of the state legislature.

The newly organized legislature having once secured possession, was determined to hold the fort. About night o'clock at night lunches were brought in to the members of the house and senate. The members lounged about in their seats waiting for the reports of their respective committees. Mr. Hale, who had so ably led the Republicans thus far, laid down upon one of the sofas and slept the greater portion of the evening. At a quarter to two in the morning the committees reported, and both houses agreed to submit questions to the supreme court. These questions involved the legal and constitutional determination of the right of each legislature to exist. In commenting upon this grave crisis Mr. Dingley

wrote: "We have now exhibited in this state a spectacle which may well bring a blush of shame on the face of every good citizen. A band of conspirators who have succeeded in illegally and fraudulently summoning persons to form a legislature, who were never elected, have been suddenly arrested in their wicked usurpation by an appeal to the supreme court—the tribunal set by the constitution to finally decide all disputed legal questions. Instead of awaiting this opinion and declaring their purpose to abide by and carry out the decision of the court of last resort, what do we see? We see the conspirators engaged in devising measures to illegally and even forcibly resist it. * * * It is not to be denied that the state is in a critical condition. The wickedness and desperation of the leading conspirators joined to their fears that their fraudulent work will be uncovered, and they themselves punished, are such as to make them ready to plunge the state into civil war. * * * The question before the supreme court was as to whether the legislature elected by the people, or the legislature summoned by Governor Garcelon, was the constitutional law-abiding power of the state of Maine. The essential points that the court was called upon to decide were these: First—Do the governor and council in canvassing legislative votes act judicially as they please, or ministerially within definite provisions of law? Second—If they act ministerially, is not their action in rejecting returns declared by the supreme court to be legal, and thereby counting out Republicans who appear to be elected by the returns, illegal, and the summons issued, and the rolls so far as they omit or substitute other names, void? Third—If such summons and rolls are illegal, are not the senators and representatives who appear to be elected by the returns legally entitled to meet and organize a senate and a house? * * * The case is now placed where the supreme court can decide whether a house and senate composed of the majority who were actually elected by the people and who appear to be elected by the returns, is the legal legislature; or the legal legislature is a body composed of men who were never elected, and who have been illegally and fraudulently summoned by a governor and council. To their decision Gen. Chamberlain, and every good citizen will bow. Until that decision is reached, General Chamberlain will maintain order and protect the public property, and turn over the property and state to the governor elected by the legislature which the supreme court—the final constitutional arbiter—shall pronounce the lawful legislative department of the state of Maine. Let every good citizen rejoice that we are now on the road to a peace-

ful and constitutional solution of a grave complication which threatened to bring anarchy upon the state. That the court will hold the legally elected members to be the lawful legislature, and overthrow a wicked conspiracy to steal a state we have no doubt."

Thus the state had two legislatures—the Pilsbury or rump legislature, and the regular legislature organized by those who were duly elected on the face of the returns. Excitement increased at the state capitol. There was a threatened collision of the two contending forces. On the 15th of January Gen. Chamberlain issued an order for the state troops to be in readiness to proceed to Augusta. The general was firm and prepared for any emergency.

The constitutional candidates for governor for the fusion house to select, were: Daniel F. Davis, Joseph L. Smith, Alonzo Garcelon, and Bion Bradbury. The fusion senate elected and inaugurated Joseph L. Smith governor of the state. Mr. Smith then called on General Chamberlain to recognize him as governor, but General Chamberlain said he could not until the supreme court recognized the claims. "Gov." Smith then gave orders to the militia but every company declined to respond. The Pilsbury or rump legislature attempted to meet in the state house January 19th but in view of the fact that the other legislature had elected and inaugurated Governor Davis, the latter, having learned that the Pilsbury legislature intended to hold the hall, refused admission at the gates. The rump legislature held a meeting in the street in front of the state house, and adjourned to Union hall.

On the Saturday previous, the regularly organized legislature met at the state house. Both halls were filled to overflow, while the crowds extended down the walk to the street adjoining. Never before was there such a throng in attendance upon the inauguration of a governor. Soon after the house was called to order Senator Blaine entered and was greeted with tumultuous applause. After three cheers had been given with a will, and a double round of cheers given for Senator Blaine, Mr. Dingley and the other Republican leaders, the proceedings began. No such scene of enthusiasm and triumph was ever witnessed in the state of Maine; and when Governor-elect Davis and his council entered the hall the applause was deafening. The house voted on two names to be sent to the senate from which to elect a governor. These two names were Daniel F. Davis, and Bion Bradbury. In the senate every vote, nineteen in number, was cast for Mr. Davis. As soon as the vote was declared the hall resounded with cheers. The house caught the spirit of the occasion and responded with like enthusiasm. Gov.

Davis was immediately inaugurated; and when Speaker Locke read the proclamation and reached the words "God save the state of Maine," a loud and responsive "amen" came from all parts of the room, followed by three more cheers for the leaders who had triumphed in this crisis. Thus a constitutional governor was inaugurated. His first act was to notify Gen. Chamberlain of the fact that he was governor of the state, whereupon Gen. Chamberlain withdrew.¹

This happy and legal solution of the question was brought about by a decision of the supreme court in answer to the questions propounded by the legislature organized by the Republicans. The unanimous opinion of the court was that the legislature elected by the people was the constitutional law-abiding power. This decision carried joy to the Republicans and the friends of fair dealings, and threw the fusionists into consternation. It finally broke the back of the conspiracy and restored law and order to the state government. But the fusionists were determined not to give up. Their governor, Joseph L. Smith, on the 16th of January attempted to remove General Chamberlain; but the latter paid no attention to the fusion executive. The Pilsbury legislature and the regular legislature were in session at the same time, the former discussing the expediency of asking the supreme court some questions on its own account. Finally it was decided to send a statement of facts and questions to the court. The court replied: "We have the honor to say that while we cannot admit, even by implication, that

1—

Augusta, Jan. 17, 1880.
To Major General J. L. Chamberlain—Sir: I have the honor to inform you that I have this day been legally elected to the office of governor and commander in chief, and have been duly qualified to perform that office in common with all the citizens of this state I have watched with great anxiety the events of the past few days, and rejoice with them in the good results of the wise and efficient measures adopted by you for the preservation of the peace and protection of the property and institutions of the state; and more especially that those results have been accomplished without resorting to military force, or permitting violence to be used. Fully recognizing the propriety of the demand made by you upon others who have claimed the right to exercise the office of governor, that they should furnish you with an authoritative decision of the court; and, believing that you will require the same of me, I hand you herewith a copy of the opinion of the justices of the supreme judicial court, sustaining the legality of the legislature by which I have been elected and qualified in the office I have named. I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

Daniel F. Davis, Governor.
Headquarters First Div. M. M.
Augusta, Jan. 17, 1880.

To the Hon. Daniel F. Davis, Sir: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication informing me that you have been legally elected and duly qualified as governor of Maine, together with a certified copy of the opinion of the supreme court upon the questions affecting the legality of the organization of the legislature of 1880. As it is manifest that this opinion establishes the legality of your election, and that you are duly qualified as governor, I have the honor to report to you that I consider my trust, under special order No. 45, as at an end. I am, with highest respects, your obedient servant,

Joshua L. Chamberlain, Major Gen.

the statement and questions now before us are presented by any legally organized legislative body, so as to require an opinion from us, we feel that we should be omitting an important service which the people of this beloved state and the gentlemen who have presented these questions, presumably from an honest desire to know their duty as citizens in the premises, might fairly expect of us, if we failed to give some of the reasons which compel us to decline to entertain and respond to the statement and questions based thereupon. The solemn occasion is indeed here, in the unparalleled and ominous events of our history which have occurred within the the last few months, but we are bound to declare that these questions are not presented by a legally constituted legislative body, for the following reasons: (Here follow lengthy reasons why the court took this position). We, therefore, after due deliberation and consideration of all matters involved, affirm and declare our judgment to be that the senate, whose presiding officer is the honorable Joseph A. Locke, and the house of representatives whose presiding officer is the Hon. George E. Weeks, constitute the legal and constitutional legislature of the state." This opinion was signed by all the members of the court.

In the meantime Gov. Davis, alarmed over the gravity of the situation, decided to call to Augusta the Auburn Light infantry, the Richmond Light infantry of Gardiner, the Capitol guards, and a detachment of ten men with a Gatling gun from the Androscoggin artillery, to prevent desperate men from carrying out their threats to capture the state house. These orders were carried out so quietly that few knew of them until the militia put in its appearance at the state house. This action of the governor was prompted by reports from the mayor of the city that secret meetings were being held and threats made and inflammatory talk indulged in by the leaders of the conspiracy. The Pilsbury or rump legislature continued to hold session in Union hall and a committee was appointed to inquire into the expediency of removing their legislature to Biddeford. There was ample evidence at this juncture of the existence of a secret confederation of socialistic fusionists, making threats to raid the stores, banks and other business centers of the city. Shortly before, a band of these fellows was discovered in the capital recesses where arms were found secreted. The whole atmosphere was poisoned by the wild talk and the senseless threats of these desperate conspirators.

The decision of the supreme court declaring the fusion legislature an illegal body, practically settled the whole matter. No de-

cision could be more sweeping—none more conclusive and binding. It not only declared Daniel F. Davis to be the lawful governor, but intimated that any person or persons claiming to exercise the duties of these officers, or claiming to be a legislature were in rebellion against the constituted authorities, enemies of the public peace, and liable to be proceeded against in the courts in the same manner as against other law breakers. This decision of the court was made public January 27th, and on the following day Mr. Dingley went to Augusta to confer with Governor Davis.

Notwithstanding the decision of the court a portion of the rump legislature wanted to fight it out, but a majority, more level-headed than the few leaders, yielded to the inevitable; and on the 28th the fusion legislature held its last session. There were 35 persons present in the house and nine in the senate. The decision of the court was generally denounced, but the majority favored yielding. Finally it was voted to adjourn until the first Wednesday in August, and, notwithstanding no division of votes was called in either branch, and no member recorded himself either for or against the measure, the proposition was declared carried and the famous fusion or rump legislature adjourned and passed into history. Gov. Smith said the decision of the court settled the matter. "I shall give up the fight now and go home," was his public statement. As soon as Gov. Smith had made public the statement that the fusionists had surrendered, the adjutant general gave orders for the militia quartered in the state capitol, to return home. Mr. Dingley, who took such an active part in the Republican advisory committee during this crisis, said in after years that the people of the state did not fully realize how near they were to violence and bloodshed at the state capitol. It required great self-control and firmness on the part of Gen. Chamberlain and the leading Republicans, to prevent a serious clash of arms; and to the credit of the fusion "governor" Smith, let it be said, that had it not been for his opposition, the capitol might have been attacked by a thousand armed fusionists, all determined to carry to the bitter end their wicked conspiracy.

The whole state was deeply indebted to Mr. Blaine and Mr. Dingley, two of their wise and able leaders in this crisis. Mr. Dingley said that "by general consent, the Republicans of Maine and the country award to Senator Blaine the highest praise for the triumph achieved over the counting-out conspirators. For two months Senator Blaine has given his whole time in devising means to checkmate a usurpation which seemed to have intrenched itself

Town of Danvers

County of Essex

(Backfield as written on the back of the return by Town Officers.)

At a legal meeting of the inhabitants of the Town of _____ in the
County of D qualified by the Constitution to vote for Representatives holden on the

(Blank spaces not filled by Town Officers.)

<u>Albin P. Bonney</u>	Selectmen. Danvers
<u>Wm. H. Baker</u>	
<u>A. F. Mason</u>	
ATTEST: <u>C. C. Spurr</u>	Town Clerk.

For Oliver B. Bragdon two hundred and seven.
James F. Lyne - One hundred and twenty five.

(The letter "P" changed to "B" thereby "counting out" the Republican Candidate.)

The whole number of ballots given in, was Forty Seven (27)


The persons voted for severally received the number of votes following, viz:

For George R. Diamond had Thirteen (13)
" Raphael D. Thompson " Thirteen (13)

<u>A. M. Adams</u>	Assessors. (Duties) 66
<u>C. F. Barnard</u>	
<u>C. L. Thetmuth</u>	

ATTEST:

C. L. Woodward Plantation Clerk,



County of Franklin.

6	Lewis Voter	Durmingtown.
7	George W. Johnson,	^{in England} Gay
1	James R. Adams John R. Adams,	Wilton
	Levi E. Paine	Weld
8	Andrew M. Oliver	Freeman.

County of Hancock.

	x Eugene Keale	Ellsworth.
	Guy W. McAllister	Bucksport.
	William Wasson	Brooksville
	Calvin Seach	Penobscot.
	George W. Clay	Bluehill
	William Fennelly	Mt. Desert.
4	Charles H. S. Webb,	Deer-Isle.
3	^{James F. Webb} Oliver P. Drayton	Sullivan.
	Elliott S. Stratton	Hancock.

EX
PART
A. 100 100
100 100

beyond powers of dislodgement. He has been the master mind who has laid plans, organized resistance to every step, restrained indignation in danger of breaking out into violence, counseled patience and opposition within the law, and in general conducted the Republican cause with ability and energy that affords fresh proof of his great ability and resources, and has again put the Republicans of Maine and of the country under fresh obligations to him."

On the 4th of February the legal legislature was fairly at work. All but about ten of the members of the fusion legislature came into the legal legislature and proceeded to take part in the regular business. On the 5th of February a committee of seven from the house, and three from the senate, were selected to examine into the condition of election returns. The committee selected was—Messrs. Hale, Strout, Lord, Ingalls, Springer, Cook, and Hill, on the part of the house; and Messrs. Hawes, Harris, and Strickland on the part of the senate. This committee at once began not only its examination of the returns, but an inspection of the state capitol to ascertain how far the conspirators had gone in their desperate attempt to gain control of the state capitol, first by fraudulent manipulation of the returns, and second, the use of force. Arms and ammunition were found stored away in almost every conceivable place, while in one desk, overlooked thus far, was found three half pint bottles filled with powder, 60 rounds of cartridges, and three bayonets for cadet rifles. Twenty cartridges were in a cartridge box for use. All the important papers relative to the canvassing of the vote were secured by the committee and the investigation proceeded. The tabulations of the returns showed conclusively that changes had been made from time to time in order to secure the requisite fusion majority in both branches. All kinds of technicalities were seized upon by the governor and council in order to count out Republicans and count in fusionists. Returns were rejected because they contained the word "scattering"; because it was alleged the names of the selectmen were signed by one person in each town; because it was claimed that the returns were not made in open town meeting; because a middle initial appeared to be a "B" instead of a "P"; because a middle initial "C" was left out; because one of the selectmen was claimed to be an alien; because the town clerk did not sign the report; and because of various other distinguishing marks. Governor Garcelon was the principal witness before the investigating committee. He said in substance that nobody outside the council had seen the returns from the day of

election to the 17th day of November; that on that day a committee of three, consisting of Mr. Dingley, Hon. S. D. Lindsey, and Hon. L. A. Emery, representing Republican candidates, waited on him and requested permission to look at the returns and see if any errors existed in them, that they might be legally corrected by the town records under the provisions of the statute. Governor Garcelon said he thought the request reasonable, but on submitting the matter to his council, it was laid over with no action until November 22nd, when it was "ordered that the governor and council will be in session from December 1st to 13th to examine the returns. Candidates claiming irregularities or other causes presumed to vitiate their election, will have reasonable opportunity to be heard either personally or by duly authorized counsel." From November 17th to December 16th, the governor said that he and the council were engaged on the returns; and that no person outside of the council was allowed to inspect them till after December 1st. Gov. Garcelon said: "If there were any changes in the returns, they were not known to me."

The returns were submitted to the governor, nearly all of them containing erasures, alterations and additions, clearly denoting the intention of some party or parties to deliberately change the result.

"Don't you think your council imposed upon you in regard to the returns?" was asked.

"Whatever was done with them was done by some Judas among the council," the governor replied.

The committee of investigation made a lengthy report, in which it submitted all the evidence, disclosed the changes and alterations made in the returns and finally declared that the whole affair was a premeditated plan of conspiracy. The special committee reported: "Your committee cannot avoid the conclusion that these suppressions and substitutions, erasures and forgeries were made in the chamber of the governor and council at Augusta. It abundantly appears that the blanks upon which new and substituted returns were written, and the envelope in which they were enclosed, were official, and such as are kept in the office of the secretary of state.

* * * The erasures are so numerous and connected with the tabulations, and were so uniform in the result produced by them, that they disclosed a well defined plan consistent in its details and in the manner of its execution. It is incredible that fraud and wrong-doing would be carried on so extensively and in connection with these returns, which day after day came before various parties connected with the executive department for their inspection, with-

out the facts being known to every official connected with the count, and if any one of them shut his eyes to what was going on, in the midst of the public clamor and excitement, which attended the counting of these returns, he must have been so negligent of his duty that his apathy would make him responsible for the wrong. But it will be very difficult to bring men of common sense to believe that these transactions were not known and acquiesced in by all the parties concerned in the counting and tabulation of the votes.

* * * The whole great fraud and crime is thrown back upon the members of the council with whatever complicity the governor had in it, or any other person whom the governor and council permitted to handle the returns, and to whose interest it was to improperly treat them. * * * To what extent Governor Garcelon participated in or sympathized with the wanton transgression of law, which the treatment of the election returns shows in dozens of cases, it is not easy for us to decide. His opportunities were constant and he fails to show a single case where he successfully interposed to prevent the wrong. When confronted with the returns, and the tabulations and the final lists, he passionately asserted his own innocence and declared that a 'Judas' among the number had done the villiany. Both governor and council must then be held accountable for the fraudulent practices under which the election returns were changed so that the will of the people was set aside and illegal certificates issued to senators and representatives in sufficient numbers to change the political complexion of both branches of the legislature."

In answer to the question why he ordered arms to be brought to the capitol, Gov. Garcelon said he thought his office and the state archives were threatened. Mr. Dingley observed that "such a complete overthrow of usurpation which threatened to undermine the central principle of free government, is not a simple victory of the Republican party—it is a victory of free institutions over despotism, patriotism over treason, law and order over anarchy and revolution, and honesty over wickedness. * * * Its defeat is a cause of profound congratulation." Thus ended the famous fusion count-out.

CHAPTER XII.

1880-1881.

In a letter to the Journal under date of April 24, 1880, Mr. Dingley wrote that "nineteen years before he shook hands with President Lincoln and interviewed him in the White House." He called upon President Hayes and upon Senator Blaine in the cloak room of the senate. He referred to Mr. Blaine as being "in perfect condition after his long strain." He appeared to be particularly interested in Alexander H. Stephens, a member of congress, who "sat in his rolling chair in front of the speaker's desk, holding on to the seat as if to keep from being translated—so much of a ghost was he. He has an ambition to die in the harness. His dark bushy hair was covered by a large Kossuth hat, which he removed from his head during the entire session."

On the 23rd of June Mr. Dingley attended a class re-union at Dartmouth college. Ten members of his class were present, and old associations of 1855 were recalled. On his way back to Maine, he stopped at Concord, N. H., where the governor of the state and ladies called upon him and his wife at the hotel. On the 9th of August he spoke at Richmond Camp grounds, and on the 17th of August entered the state campaign. The Republican state convention was held at Augusta June 23rd. Governor Davis was renominated with great enthusiasm. The platform indorsed the nomination of James A. Garfield for president, and denounced the record of the fusion party in the state. The national convention met in Chicago June 8th and nominated James A. Garfield for president, and Chester A. Arthur for vice president. Again the admirers of Mr. Blaine saw their idol doomed to defeat. Mr. Ding-

ley, who was always a warm supporter of Mr. Blaine wrote: "Though Senator Blaine has failed to receive the nomination for the presidency which the Republicans of Maine so earnestly desire him to have, yet he has the satisfaction of knowing that he has been supported by a devotion and earnestness rarely accorded to a public man. Not only has his own state given him a united, hearty and enthusiastic support, but the Republicans of a majority of the northern states have also given him a support rarely accorded a public man. Though failing to secure the nomination for himself, yet it has been through his popularity and organizing ability that the scheme of a few men to control the Republican party has been overthrown; and a man selected who is not only the friend of Mr. Blaine, but who also owes his nomination to him. The vote of Maine for Garfield was given by request of Mr. Blaine. Though failing to receive the presidency which he would have so highly honored, yet Senator Blaine will not fail to have in the future, as is the past, the proud distinction of being one of the ablest and best loved of American statesmen."¹ Harris M. Plaisted was nominated for governor by separate conventions of the Greenback and Democratic parties, held at Bangor, June 1st.

In this campaign the Prohibition party made its first appearance. The national party was organized at Chicago, September 1, 1869. A convention was held in the city of Augusta September 1, 1876, and an effort made to organize the Prohibition party in Maine; but it was unsuccessful. June 1st, 1880, a convention was held at Ellsworth and a permanent organization effected. William P. Joy was nominated for governor. Other temperance men held a convention at Augusta, July 23rd, adjourned to Portland August 19th, and there nominated J. K. Osgood for governor. Upon his declination Joshua Nye was made the candidate. The organization was discontinued after the September election.

Mr. Dingley began his campaign tour the night of August 17th. speaking every night until September 10th. In this campaign Stan-

1—The movement against Blaine's nomination started with Cameron in Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania was a Blaine state, but the unit rule was forced upon the delegation. Grant had failed in nomination in 1876 and went around the world returning in time to stand for the nomination in 1880. Garfield's name had been mentioned as a compromise candidate, the Pittsburg Dispatch naming him first. Wharton Barker, prevailed upon a member of the Pennsylvania delegation to vote for Garfield. This was the only vote Garfield received for several ballots. Finally he secured a few more. Then the Sherman and the Blaine men got together and nominated him. Garfield was true to Sherman and felt the great responsibility the nomination brought. He was sensitive about the stories that he had betrayed Sherman, and in making up his cabinet refused to select any unknown men for fear he would be charged with rewarding some man for voting for him. This was why Wharton Barker of Philadelphia was not given a cabinet place.

ley Matthews, John A. Logan, Stewart L. Woodford, Thomas B. Reed, James A. Hall and other prominent Republicans assisted. The issue was greenbackism and the conspiracy of the fusionists at the state capitol. The people were thoroughly aroused, and Mr. Dingley on the stump and in his editorial room, fought for the Republican cause. A few days before election he wrote: "Next Monday the voters of Maine are called upon to participate in one of the most important elections ever held in this state. Although a state election in form, yet the votes will be practically the verdict of the state on national as well as state issues. It will be received by the whole country as a declaration in favor of Garfield and the Republican party in case Davis shall be elected by a good majority; and as a declaration in favor of Hancock and the Democracy in case Plaisted shall be elected. * * * The people of Maine are called upon to pronounce their verdict on the violence and fraud by which the opposition to the Democracy is overcome in Alabama and the south. * * * And last but not least, the people of Maine are called upon to pass their verdict on the outrageous proceedings by which the late fusion governor and council attempted to overthrow the verdict of the people at the polls last September." September 7th Mr. Dingley spoke at Yarmouth with Gen. Grosvenor, who subsequently served with him in congress on the committee on ways and means. September 11th Lewiston closed the campaign with a big torch light procession. The election was held September 13th, and Plaisted received 73,713 votes, Davis 73,544 votes, Nye, the temperance candidate, 309 votes, and Joy, the Prohibition candidate, 124 votes.

The election instead of resulting in a complete Republican triumph and a Republican majority of at least 5,000, as was confidently expected by the Republicans, proved closer than was generally expected, and disappointed the Republicans. It was in fact a Republican disaster. On representatives to congress the Republicans held their own—electing Reed, Frye, and Lindsey, while the fusionists elected Ladd and Murch. The legislature was Republican—the house by 20 majority and the senate by 11 majority, thus ensuring a Republican executive council, and a Republican United States senator to succeed Senator Hamlin.

Mr. Dingley observed that "it is amazing a majority of the voters of Maine should have gone to the polls and practically voted to endorse the state steal. Many will say that they did not intend this; but whether or not they intended it, the country and the counting-out gentlemen will so understand it. This is the most

mortifying result of the election, and almost leads one to ask whether our boasted intelligence and virtue really exists. But when we remember that good voters are often temporarily blinded by partisan prejudice, we take courage in the thought that sooner or later the good sense and conscience of the people of Maine will emphatically condemn a wrong of such magnitude. For the time being, the result will cause a feeling of despondency in the Republican ranks. But this will soon pass and the Republicans of this state and of the country will realize, as they have not before, that victory in the nation is not to be won without hard work. * * * Although there may be a small majority against us now in Maine, yet this will be overcome in November. The fusion between the Democrats and Greenbackers has been perfect on the state ticket. * * * The campaign in Maine is not closed but only begun. Six weeks of good work can change what is now a partial fusion advantage into a glorious Republican triumph."

The Prohibition party, as has already been said, first made its appearance in Maine in this state election. Mr. Dingley commented on this movement thus: "Truly, if prohibition and temperance have only the small body of supporters who went to the polls and voted the two prohibitory tickets, prohibition would be in a sad minority in Maine. But the earnest, active, temperance men of this state, the men who have given Maine her prohibitory laws, and put her in the front rank of temperance, almost solidly voted the Republican ticket, which in Maine, is the true temperance party. It is to be hoped that the sincere friends of this independent political movement will see its inexpediency and no longer pursue a line of action which only tends to divide and weaken the temperance party."

In the selection of an electoral ticket, the greenback leaders of the state sold out completely to the Democrats. Solon Chase, however, entered a protest and with seventy other members of the convention, withdrew and nominated a straight Greenback electoral ticket. But Greenbackism was on the wane, and Solon Chase, the Greenback candidate for governor in 1882, received only 1,324 votes. Thus the Democrats completely absorbed the Greenback party, and the latter disappeared from Maine politics as a disturbing element.

October 14th, Mr. Dingley attended a campfire of the boys in blue in Lewiston. On the next day he spoke at a state teachers meeting, and on the 21st delivered an address at Farmington. He discussed in the columns of the Journal questions of national

finance and honest elections in the south. Of the tariff question he wrote: "The Democratic managers in the northern states who have manufacturing industries which would be seriously injured if a revenue tariff should take the place of a protective tariff, are in serious trouble. The Democratic party is committed in its platform and by its record to the overthrow of a protective tariff and the adoption of the British revenue system. That cannot be denied. But some of the managers are now trying to make people believe that the Democratic party would not carry out its platform if it should be voted into power. Even Hancock himself is out with a letter trying to make the voters believe that the Democrats will not do what their platform promises, in spite of the fact that their acts speak louder than mere ante-election promises. * * * What the Democrats propose to do, if they carry the election next month, is better shown by the votes of the Democratic members of congress last spring, and the revenue tariff plank adopted at Cincinnati, than by irresponsible professions to secure votes on the eve of an election. The people of the country have not forgotten that the Democrats in 1844 carried Pennsylvania by professing themselves in favor of a protective tariff and then a year after passing the tariff of 1864 which prostrated American industries. * * * The 'tariff for revenue only' plank was adopted on demand of the southern delegates in the Cincinnati convention. The western free traders backed up their demand. When it comes to legislation the south and west control the Democratic congressional caucus by an overwhelming majority, and the protests of a handful of eastern Democrats representing manufacturing constituencies will not keep them from carrying out the principles of their party set forth in its national platform. A revenue tariff bill having no regard to the interest of home manufacturers, will be passed by a Democratic congress as a leading feature of Democratic policy. * * *

The protective tariff is of great advantage to farmers. First, it provides a home market for the product of the farm, and builds up our agricultural interests as it builds home industries. Second, it directly protects such important Maine products as lumber, wool, butter, eggs, potatoes, etc., from the injurious competition of the British provinces, where labor is cheaper and the workingman has less possibilities than in this country. Were it not for our protective tariff our farmers would not produce many of the leading articles of farm product with profit. On the other hand most of the necessary articles which the farmer requires, are as cheap here as in Europe. Those articles whose prices are increased by tariff so far

as it is protective, are generally not the necessities, but the luxuries."

In reply to an article published by a Democratic free trade paper, Mr. Dingley said: "It is true that both parties favor a tariff as one of the means of raising revenue for the government. The question is shall the tariff be laid for revenue only, as the Democratic platform declares; or for revenue and protection to American labor, as the Republican platform declares. The distinction between these two kinds of tariffs is well understood by those who want to know it, and it is rank deception for the Democratic leaders to endeavor to evade it. A tariff for revenue only imposes duties mainly on articles not produced in this country; and so far as it reaches articles which are produced here, it makes the duty as light as possible in order to encourage importation. A tariff for revenue and protection imposes duties mainly on articles that are also produced in this country, and thus protects our own industries and our own labor against the injurious competition of the cheaper labor of Europe. But we are not left to party platform declarations alone. Of the 155 Democrats in the present congress, all but 19 voted in favor of the Wood revenue tariff bill; and of the 130 Republicans in congress all but six voted against it. If the Wood tariff bill had passed, it would have cut down the duties on cotton, woolen, leather, and iron goods to such a degree, as to bring these foreign goods produced by cheaper labor into direct competition with our own. This would necessitate either the closing of our cotton, woolen and iron mills, and boot and shoe manufactories; or else would have made it necessary to cut down wages here to the English and German standard. * * * The conclusion of the whole matter is that the protective tariff, which the Republicans advocate, gives the American workingman 25 per cent higher wages, larger saving, a better living, a better house, a better education for his children, better social surroundings and a better future for his children than is possible for the European workingman. Substitute for this the revenue system which the Democrats favor, and American working men must come down to the European standard. To vote for Garfield is to vote for the protective system. To vote for Hancock is to vote for the revenue system. Working men of Maine! Citizens generally, who appreciate the advantages of manufacturing industries and good wages! Which do you prefer?"

October 29th, Mr. Dingley made a political address at Mechanic Falls, in which he discussed very fully and very ably the tariff question. After defining the difference between the platforms

of the Republican and Democratic parties, and declaring that Republicans were in favor of a protective tariff, he said: "If the status and wages of the workingmen of America were the same as in Europe and Canada, then we could say to the manufacturers of England, Belgium, and Germany, and the producers of potatoes, eggs, cheese, wool and lumber of the British province, send your manufactures and products here without charge or restraint, and we will take our chances in competition with you. But we have undertaken to found here a nation in which every man shall be the political equal of every other man. In Europe one man is the sovereign, and the great mass of the people have no direct responsibility in government. Here, every man is a sovereign and in exercising the right of suffrage discharges the duties of a sovereign. To properly discharge this duty, every citizen of this country must be educated, must educate his children, must live not as a mere machine, but as an intelligent being. To be a working man in America is to have a larger life, higher responsibilities, greater possibilities and greater needs than to be a working man in Europe. This is a part of our free system by which labor is elevated and ennobled and made not only respectable but worthy to be respected. And I trust we shall never see the time when our workingmen will have to come down to European wages; for if we ever should then there will come with it the other degradation of American labor to the lower conditions we find it in Europe. * * * The manufacturers of American make no more profit than the manufacturers of Europe because competition keeps profit down to the average in all other kinds of business. It is the workingmen who reap the benefits of protection, as is clearly shown by the fact that the workingmen of America get 25 per cent to 75 per cent higher wages than the workingmen of Europe, and are thus enabled to live better, to educate their children, to lay up a surplus in many cases, and to look forward to a better future."

On the night of November 1st there was a great Republican rally in City hall, Lewiston. Mr. Dingley presided, and Senator Blaine made the principal address. The election took place November 2nd, and there was great interest all over the state. Extra editions of the Journal were published all night long and the crowds on the streets and in the public places were excited. Maine gave Garfield 10,000 plurality, and over 5,000 majority. The Republican candidates for president and vice president—James A. Garfield, and Chester A. Arthur—were elected, receiving a majority of 59 in the electoral votes. Mr. Dingley wrote: "We congratulate the

Republicans of the country, the freemen of the north, the patriotic men of all parties, on the glorious victory that has been won. It has been a hard contest, but the patriotism, the intelligence, the good sense of the nation have spoken and the triumph is complete. * * * The victory assures the state of Maine to the Republicans hereafter. There are many Democrats who have voted the Democratic ticket for the last time. The Greenback party has been hopelessly disorganized by fusion. The questions which brought it into being have been practically settled by resumption and prosperity. The Greenbackers of Democratic antecedents who have voted for fusion and Hancock, are largely back in the Democratic party. The Greenbackers of Republican antecedents have mainly returned to the Republican party; and those who still remain, will be likely to join their Republican associates before another election two years hence, except in the few cases where they have got so far into the Democratic camp as to make a return impractical. In 1882, if the Republicans in the meantime act with the wisdom and prudence which may be expected, Maine will undoubtedly resume her usual Republican majorities."

December 3rd, Mr. Dingley attended a reception given to Bishop Peck at City hall, Lewiston, responding to the toast, "The Church and State." December 30th he lectured at Pittsfield on "Free High Schools;" thence he went to Augusta where he conferred with the friends of Congressman Frye relative to the senatorial question.

The legislature which met in Augusta in January, after electing Plaisted governor, proceeded to elect a United States senator to succeed Senator Hamlin. Already Congressman Frye had consented to be a candidate and his friends throughout the state were preparing for the contest. It was reported by some of the newspapers of the state that Mr. Frye was a candidate for speaker of the house; but Mr. Dingley was authorized to state that such was not the case, but that Mr. Frye would be a candidate for senator; "and," it was added, "he will receive a strong support. His ability, his reputation as a public speaker, his long experience in congress, and the personal popularity which he has maintained in his repeated re-elections, all conspire to make him prominent among the gentlemen mentioned for this high position. Without detracting from the merits of the other distinguished gentlemen, who are candidates for this position—Messrs. Hale and Reed—it is only justice to say that neither surpasses Mr. Frye in all the essentials which go to make a successful senator."

Early in December, Congressman Reed retired from the senatorial contest, leaving the field clear to Congressman Frye and Former Congressman Eugene Hale. Public sentiment seemed to drift toward Mr. Frye, but Mr. Hale, who had made a good record in congress from 1869 to 1879, when he was defeated by a fusionist, and as leader of the Republicans in the state house of representatives during the famous count-out, and who was a special favorite of Senator Blaine, steadily forged ahead and took the lead. But Mr. Dingley loyally supported Mr. Frye, saying: "No man in the state has higher qualifications for this position than Mr. Frye. His unquestioned ability as a parliamentarian and debater; his legal acquirements so clearly shown in the discharge of his duties as attorney general of Maine, and in the argument of cases before the jury and law court; and his long and successful experience as a legislator, are admitted on all hands to especially fit him for the senatorship. * * * While we have given expression to the general judgment of Republicans in this session, it is but just we should add that all concur in the view that it is the duty of the Republican representatives to carefully ascertain and carry out the wishes of their Republican constituents. If the wishes of the great body of Republicans are respected, if the decision is based entirely on what will best subserve the interests of the state and promote harmony and increase public confidence in the Republican party, —all will be well. It is fortunate that so important a question is to be solved by so prudent and faithful a body of men as constitutes the Republican membership of the next legislature."

The state legislature met January 5th, 1881. Mr. Dingley was on the scene of action two days earlier, to look after Congressman Frye's interests. Mr. Hale was on the ground conducting his own canvass, while Mr. Frye was in Washington. January 6th, the day before the caucus, it was decided by Mr. Frye's friends to withdraw his name from the contest because of defections in Sagadahoc and Oxford counties. The next day at the Republican caucus, Mr. Hale was unanimously nominated. Mr. Frye immediately became a candidate to succeed Senator Blaine in case the latter should accept the portfolio of secretary of state in the cabinet of President Garfield. Immediately upon the announcement that Mr. Frye would become a candidate for the short senatorial term, Mr. Reed announced his candidacy for speaker of the national house of representatives. January 18th the state legislature proceeded to the election of United States senator; and on the following day met

in joint convention and elected Mr. Hale to succeed Senator Hamlin. The fusionists voted for Joseph L. Smith.

An important conference of senators and representatives of the second congressional district was held on the evening of January 18th. It was the unanimous opinion of all present that Mr. Frye should be tendered the nomination for United States senator to fill the unexpired term of Senator Blaine, in case that gentleman accepted a position in the cabinet. Mr. Dingley was one of the first to learn that President Garfield had tendered a cabinet position to Senator Blaine. It will be remembered that Mr. Blaine was instrumental in securing Mr. Garfield's nomination in the Chicago convention. Late in December Senator Blaine wrote Mr. Dingley a personal letter asking the latter's opinion as to the advisability of his accepting the position of secretary of state. ¹ Mr. Dingley immediately replied urging Mr. Blaine to accept the post. Mr. Blaine followed this advice, and on the 7th day of March sent to Governor Plaisted his resignation of the senatorship. March 8th Mr. Frye was unanimously nominated by the Republicans to succeed Senator Blaine, and on the 15th of the month was elected United States senator. Concerning the appointment of Mr. Blaine, Mr. Dingley said that "in all these positions, Mr. Blaine proved himself one of the ablest, most brilliant and most popular of American statesmen. His elevation to the premiership of President Garfield's administration is a deserved recognition of the foremost Republican statesman. His special fitness for this responsible position is conceded by all parties." Concerning Mr. Frye's election to the United States senate to succeed Mr. Blaine, Mr. Dingley wrote: "Mr. Frye's promotion to the senate will be regarded everywhere as just and appropriate, and will be especially gratifying to his associates in Washington. In the senate Mr. Frye will prove a worthy successor to Mr. Blaine, and will reflect honor on the party and the state which he has been called upon to represent." March 9th, Mr. Frye resigned his seat in the national house, thereby creating a vacancy in the position of representative to congress from the 2nd district, and necessitating a special election at such a time as Governor Plaisted might indicate. Mr. Dingley decided to be a candidate for this vacancy.

1—Senator Blaine's letter to Mr. Dingley was as follows:

Fifth Ave. Hotel, New York,
Dec. 23rd, 1880.

Bro. Dingley,

Would you advise me to accept the position of secretary of state under Garfield, if he should tender it. Give me your views fully—all the pros and cons. Write me here.

Yours,

J. G. Blaine.

During this busy and exciting period, Mr. Dingley found time to attend a state temperance convention at Augusta where he delivered an address, to appear before the judiciary committee of the state house of representatives, to speak at an editors banquet at Augusta, to deliver a temperance address at Farmington, to speak at an Irish land league meeting at Biddeford, to attend a reception to Governor Plaisted, at Auburn, and to journey to Philadelphia and Washington where he sought a brief rest.

May 20th the call was issued for the Republican congressional convention to be held in the city of Auburn June 23rd. The Republican caucus in Lewiston held June 14th gave Mr. Dingley 178 votes—the whole number cast. June 18th he carried the Auburn caucus. He thus secured a solid delegation from his own county. June 22nd he took up his headquarters at the Elm house, Auburn. Here he conferred with his supporters from all over the district. The convention met at ten o'clock on the morning of June 23rd. Former Governor Perham was present and addressed the convention. Delegates from the four counties in the district—Androscoggin, Sagadahoc, Franklin, and Oxford,—were present in full force. C. J. Talbot was made chairman of the convention, and F. N. Drew, an old personal friend of Mr. Dingley, was made chairman of the committee on resolutions. The first ballot resulted as follows: Dingley 124, Foster 58, Swasey 33, Wakefield 32, Spaulding 10, Goss 3. There was no choice. Mr. Hogan a delegate from Sagadahoc, then addressed the convention urging the nomination of Mr. Wakefield. Mr. Hoyt of Franklin made a speech in behalf of the candidate from his county. Mr. Farrington of Fryburg, appealed to the convention in behalf of Enoch Foster, Oxford's candidate. The second ballot resulted as follows: Dingley 127, Foster 56, Swasey 33, Wakefield 34, Spaulding 10, and Goss 1. Still there was no choice. A delegate then rose to his feet and urged the nomination of Spaulding as a soldier's candidate. The convention continued to ballot, notwithstanding dinner had been omitted. A motion to adjourn was defeated, and the third ballot resulted as follows: Dingley 131, Foster 51, Wakefield 33, Swasey 36, Spaulding 10, Goss 1. Still there was no choice. The fourth ballot resulted as follows: Dingley 134, Foster 53, Swasey 35, Wakefield 32, Spaulding 8. Mr. Dingley was declared nominated and the announcement was received with great applause.

While a committee was waiting upon Mr. Dingley, Senator Frye made a vigorous speech. Late in the afternoon the commit-

tee returned, escorting the nominee who was received with prolonged applause. In accepting the nomination he said: "Mr. President and gentlemen of the convention: I am informed by a committee that you have designated me as the Republican candidate for congress from this district. I tender you my sincere thanks for this mark of your confidence. I accept the nomination with a due sense, I trust, of the honor which it confers and the obligation which it imposes. It is an honor to be named for the vacancy caused by the resignation of the distinguished gentleman who has been called to represent the whole state in the senate of the United States. It is a high honor to be the candidate of the Republicans of the second district of Maine—a district which for more than a quarter of a century has been the political star of the east which has never set. It is a special honor to be designated the standard bearer of the great Republican party whose career has been so patriotic, so honorable and so grand. The record of the Republican party is its proudest monument. Not that it has never made a mistake in any incident of its grand career. That is too much to expect of any human organization. But the great principles which it has championed, and the leading features of its policy, for the twenty-six years of its existence, have been shown by the test of experience, to have been just, wise and patriotic. Who now doubts the wisdom of the principle of dedicating the common territory of the union to freedom, as was sought by the Republican party in the presidential elections of 1856 and 1860? Who now questions the wisdom of prosecuting the war until the rebellion was crushed, and slavery overthrown, as was settled by the Republican success in 1864? Who now hesitates to approve the constitutional guarantees of equal rights, as secured by the Republican triumph in 1868? Who now doubts the expediency of insisting that the enforcement of these guarantees should be continued in the hands of the men who stood by the union, as was decided by the Republican victory in 1872? Who now questions the wisdom of the resumption of specie payments and maintenance of the public faith as was assured by the Republican success in 1876? I revert to the record of the Republican party, because it is by parties' as well as men's records, that we are best enabled to judge their future. The party as well as the individual which has been the wisest and most faithful in discharging the duties of the past, will be most likely to best grapple with the duties of the present and future. But, happily, the Republican party can point not only to what it has done, but also to what it is doing and proposes

to do, as its claims for confidence. It can point to a national administration which in four short months has by a masterly financial stroke saved thirteen millions annually in the interest on the public debt; which has made itself a terror to evil doers in every branch of the public service; which has settled a fishery difficulty that disturbed our relations with Great Britain; and last but not least, has asserted the right of a responsible president instead of irresponsible bosses to nominate national officials. The Republican party can point to its position on living issues without evasion and with confidence. It insists that in all revisions of the tariff the principle of protection to home industry and labor shall be faithfully maintained. It demands that specie resumption shall be steadily maintained. It resists all attempts to admit foreign built ships to American registry, and seeks by wise legislation to foster our ship-building and commercial interests. It insists, or ought to insist on the distribution of the balance of the Geneva award to actual sufferers from the operations of all the Anglo-Confederate cruisers. It asks that the national debt, reduced to the lowest rate of interest, shall be paid as rapidly as the surplus revenue will admit. And last but not least, it demands that the fundamental right of all free governments—the right of every duly qualified citizen to cast one and only one ballot, and to have that vote fairly counted, shall be rigidly maintained in every part of the union.

"Mr. President and Gentlemen: On such issues as I have mentioned, as you well know, I stand with and for the Republican party. But I do not forget that there are not so many points of public policy in which all good citizens disagree as those on which they agree, and in which a representative in congress represents not one party, but all parties, and the whole people. I trust that in the discharge of the public duties which have been imposed upon me in the past I have given proof of my desire to put the interests of the whole people first. I stand with right-minded men of all parties in seeking to do that which will advance the interests of our district, state and country; that which will promote harmony, honesty, and efficiency in every branch of the public service, and that which will elevate manhood, promote virtue and temperance, and improve the condition of our fellow men.

"Once more accept my thanks for the honor you have done me, and my best wishes for your individual health and prosperity."

The resolutions adopted re-affirmed the principles of the last Republican national convention, and declared in favor of a sound currency based on specie; approved the administration of Presi-

dent Garfield and added that "in presenting Nelson Dingley Jr. as our candidate for congress, we point with pride to his distinguished record as a legislator and as the chief magistrate of our state as a sure guarantee of his eminent qualification for the duties of representative in congress, and we cordially commend his nomination to the voters of the district." The nomination was received with unusual marks of favor not only in the state but in all New England. Congratulations began to come in and continued for several days. It was altogether a strong and popular nomination.

One of the inexplicable things in the political history of the second Maine district, is the fact that the third party prohibitionists, persisted in nominating a candidate of their own for congress, notwithstanding the spotless record of Mr. Dingley on the question of temperance and prohibition. The Prohibition party of this district held a convention, and nominated Col. W. T. Eustis of Dixfield as their candidate. The Greenback district convention nominated Judge Washington Gilbert of Bath. The resolutions adopted condemned the national banking system, and urged that the power of issuing money should be restored to the people to whom it belonged. A national debt was declared a curse, monopolies were condemned, and the charges preferred by the Republican and Democratic parties against each other, were pronounced "enough to make every honest man hang down his head in shame."

Franklin Reed was nominated by the Democrats, but on the 9th of September withdrew, leaving Mr. Dingley and Judge Gilbert the only candidates in the field. The feeling among the Republicans throughout the district was unusually good, and Mr. Dingley was supported loyally by the Republican newspapers and Republican party workers. Even many of the Democratic papers supported him because of his spotless record and high character. The Oxford Democrat espoused his cause by saying that "a christian gentleman combining natural ability with broad experience in all the walks of life, is a compendium of Mr. Dingley's biography. He will prove false to the record of his whole life if he does not make us a faithful, popular and able representative." The Boston Journal said that "he is not only a gentleman of high character and rare qualifications for the position, but he enjoys the confidence and esteem of not only the Republicans, but of the best citizens of Maine." The Albany Journal said that "he is one of the most accomplished citizens of Maine, and made one of the best governors that she ever had." Mr. Dingley canvassed the entire district; and while returning from South Paris where he conferred

with several Oxford county Republicans, learned of the assassination of President Garfield. On the 4th of July he was at Phillips where he made an able address.

It was at this time that the long vendetta ¹ between Mr. Blaine and Mr. Conkling was again brought to public notice by the resignation of Senator Conkling and his appeal to the New York state legislature for a re-election and a vindication. A collector for the port of New York, distasteful to Mr. Conkling had been appointed by President Garfield. ² The fight between the two Republican factions culminated in a tragedy; and President Garfield, laid low by the bullet of Guiteau, was now at death's door. For weeks the New York legislature was in a deadlock over the senatorial succession. Finally the last chapter was read and the book closed late in July. The New York legislature elected Messrs. Miller and

1—The controversy between Mr. Blaine and Mr. Conkling began on the floor of the house of representatives in the 39th congress. It was fraught with serious consequences to the contestants and changed the fortunes of the Republican party. When the army bill was before the house in April 1886, Mr. Conkling moved to strike out the sections which made an appropriation for the support of the provost marshal general. Mr. Conkling supported his motion in a speech in which he not only assailed the office but also the officer, General James B. Fry. On the 30th day of April Mr. Blaine read from his seat a letter in which General Fry made charges against Mr. Conkling. Upon the reading of the letter a debate arose which was both personal and abusive. Mr. Conkling replied to his antagonist and ended by charging him with "frivolous impertinence." A few days later the battle was renewed by Mr. Blaine who referred to the gentleman from New York as "the member from the Utica district." The controversy continued, growing more bitter every day. Samuel S. Cox thus describes it in his book "The Three Decades:" "This debate showed Mr. Conkling in his best light of repartee, so far as the house was concerned. Several gentlemen interposed to stop, if they could, the blows that were given and taken, but Mr. Blaine, who was still in the dialectics and rules of the house got the last word; and after replying to what he called 'the cruel sarcasm,' in which Mr. Conkling was an expert, he hoped that he would not be too severe in that mode of handling his innocent self. Then Mr. Blaine referred to the 'little jocosse satire of Theodore Tilton—that the mantle of Davis had fallen upon the gentleman from New York' and that that gentleman had taken it seriously, and it had given 'an additional strut to his pomposity.' 'It is striking,' said Mr. Blaine, 'Hyperion to a satyr, Thersites to Hercules, mud to marble, dunghill to diamond, a singed cat to a Bengal tiger, a whining puppy to a roaring lion.' These phrases have never been repeated," continues Mr. Cox, "in the house with so much vindictive animosity. But the Democrats enjoyed it. It was not their fight."

The controversy thus opened came to an end only with Mr. Conkling's death.

2—Hon. George S. Boutwell writes in McClure's Magazine for January 1900: "From Mr. Jewell I received the following statement as coming from President Garfield: When the New York nominations were sent to the senate, the President was forthwith in the receipt of letters and despatches in protest coupled with the suggestion that everything had been surrendered to Conkling. Without delay and without consultation with anyone the President nominated Judge Robertson to the office of collector of New York. Further, the President said, as reported by Mr. Jewell, Mr. Blaine heard of the nomination and came in very pale and very much astonished. From Mr. Blaine I received the specific statement that he had no knowledge of the nomination of Judge Robertson until it had been made. These statements are reconcilable with each other, and place the responsibility for the sudden and fatal rupture of the relations between Mr. Conkling and the President upon the President."

2—Robertson's nomination as collector of New York was urged not by Mr. Blaine himself but by Mr. Blaine's friends. This was particularly distasteful to Conkling, and the latter, instead of going to Garfield and talking it over, attacked Garfield in the public press. Then Garfield could not back down.

Lapham United States senators in the place of Messrs. Platt and Conkling. It was perfectly natural for the friends of Mr. Blaine to rejoice over the defeat of Mr. Blaine's old antagonist. Mr. Dingley, as a warm admirer of Mr. Blaine, shared in the latter's triumph, and said that "with few dissenting voices the Republicans of the country will rejoice. The rejoicing will extend outside of the Republican party because the spirit and methods of Conkling have been distasteful to candid men of all parties. Nothing can be clearer than that the voice of the country, as well as New York, has emphatically condemned Mr. Conkling in his uncalled-for warfare on President Garfield."

The campaign proceeded vigorously. Mr. Dingley on the stump and in the editorial columns of his paper fought for Republican principles. The Prohibitionists of the district were thrown into consternation by a card published in the Portland Press by Neal Dow, the apostle of prohibition, in which he said that "there is no man in the country more widely known as a true and tried prohibitionist than Governor Dingley. All his life he has been that, from a settled conviction that the liquor traffic is a great public and social mischief. The vote for the Prohibition candidate, therefore, will in no way indicate the opinion of the people of the second district as to the wisdom or otherwise of the policy of the Maine law."

Mr. Dingley took a decided stand on the money question, repeatedly stating that he was absolutely opposed to an irredeemable currency, and the free and unrestricted coinage of the Bland silver dollar. Concerning the latter proposition he said that it was obvious "no nation can succeed in successfully maintaining a coinage ratio for legal tender silver, without limiting the coinage to small amounts on government account." He said that to make coinage free, "is to give to owners of silver bullion the 14 cents profit now secured by government to the extent that the value of the Bland dollars can be maintained equal to gold. If anyone can give a good reason why owners of silver mines should have this profit taken from the people's treasury and turned over to them, we should like to hear it."

July 18th Judge Gilbert issued a "blind" challenge to Mr. Dingley to join in a public debate of the questions at issue. Mr. Dingley promptly replied that he would accept and discuss questions, about the middle of August, provided distinct questions for discussion could be agreed upon. Mr. Gilbert did not wish to be confined and limited in a discussion and charged Mr. Dingley with

avoiding meeting his opponent. But after much quibbling over the question as to whether he should discuss the Greenback or the Democratic platform, Mr. Gilbert finally decided to let the matter pass. At all events the two candidates never appeared in joint discussion. The silver question, the greenback question and the national banking system were ably discussed by Mr. Dingley on the stump and in his editorial columns. In answer to the claim of the Greenbackers that the national bank system was robbing the people, and that the government should issue its own currency, Mr. Dingley said that "a political currency, a currency which can be voted down and up by party majorities in congress, would make everything uncertain in business and destroy the confidence essential to prosperity. The very men who shout the loudest for congress to control the volume of paper currency, recognize the inherent impracticability of that policy in dealing with other currency than paper, for they are earnest advocates of free coinage of gold—a universal policy—by which the volume of gold currency is determined by owners of gold bullion, and not by government. The self-interest of owners of gold bullion leads them to have it coined whenever there is a demand for it. The only reason why government controls the volume of silver currency is because it is minted at more than its bullion value, and therefore it is necessary to restrict the amount coined in order to prevent its depreciation."

The special election in the second district was held September 12th; and notwithstanding the fact that Hon. Franklin Reed, the Democratic candidate for congress, was withdrawn from the contest, four days before the election, Mr. Dingley was elected by over 5,000 majority. This election showed that the Republican party was firm in its faith in Republican principles, and enthusiastic in its support of President Garfield. It also revealed the fact that the Democratic and Greenback parties in the state of Maine were disintegrating. The Boston Journal said of the result that "Mr. Dingley brings to his new responsibilities a clear mind, a clean reputation, and a wide experience as a journalist, a man of affairs, and experience in public life." The Portland Press said that "he is an able, fearless and incorruptible man, who will add measurably to the strength of the Maine delegation." It was a significant fact that the Republican majority for governor in Lewiston in the September election of 1880 was 128, while the Republican majority for congressman this year was 979.

The congratulations and expressions of good will were very gratifying to Mr. Dingley. He was made to feel that his efforts


in behalf of honest legislation and moral government, were not in vain. He rejoiced, as did his many loyal friends and supporters, not only in his district but all over the state. But their joy was tinged with sorrow, for on the 19th of the month news of the death of President Garfield flashed over the wires. Of this great calamity Mr. Dingley said: "The government will go on. The vacant seat has been filled. Assassination cannot revolutionize. It can only harrow and perplex. That God may sustain the widow and the fatherless, who have laid their most precious offering on the altar of their country, will now be the nation's prayer. That the successor in the executive chair of him whom the nation mourns, may be divinely guided, all the people now fervently pray." On the 20th of the month there was a public meeting in Lewiston where expressions of sorrow over the great calamity were made by Mr. Dingley and others. Of President Garfield Mr. Dingley said: "As a statesman we see him as a man who could in no way be turned from the strict line of duty. Here his integrity and moral purpose stand out bright and marked. He was inspired by true patriotism. and used his powerful, highly disciplined mind in the advocacy and support of just principles. When it seemed as though the ideas of the advocates of an irredeemable paper currency were to sweep over the country and change our financial policy, Garfield stood in the house of representatives, almost alone among western men, as the bold, aggressive, uncompromising defender of a sound currency. It is that integrity and honesty, united with a noble christian character that can raise the poor boy from the humblest lot to the highest station in the gift of a free people and secure for him the admiration and praise of the civilized world." On the 25th of September Mr. Dingley spoke at the children's Garfield memorial services in the Congregational church, Lewiston, and on the 29th went to Augusta where he conferred with Secretary Blaine. On the 26th of October he spoke at the state Sunday school convention at Waterville; November 3rd lectured at Buckfield on "Conditions of Success," and on the 10th of the month attended a meeting of the Republican state committee at Portland. November 30th, in company with his devoted wife and daughter, he started for the city of Washington and the national capitol, the scene of his subsequent triumphs.

CHAPTER XIII.

1881-1883.

In searching for the causes of the success or failure of a public man in any epoch, the student of history examines carefully the conditions surrounding his entrance upon the scene of action. The nation had emerged from a civil war to be plunged immediately into the problem of reconstruction.

President Grant's administrations, covering a period of eight years, had divided the Republican party, some believing it to be the duty of the president to continue a policy of interference in southern affairs, others believing that the difficult problem could best be worked out by the people themselves without any outside pressure. Certainly President Grant's policy was not as firm and uncompromising as was to be expected from the hero of the civil war. But this feeling of discontent was somewhat ameliorated by the attitude of the Republican party in the matter of the national debt and the public credit. Its position rallied to its support and solidified the great conservative and yet powerful business interests of the country against the vagaries of the fiat money men. But even this did not prevent the crystallization of a movement set on foot by a small element of conscientious men who believed that President Grant's policy toward the south was wrong. They wanted to be liberal and called themselves "Liberal Republicans." But the movement failed miserably and Horace Greeley went down to ignominious defeat. The nomination of Mr. Hayes by the Republicans and the defeat of Mr. Blaine by his old-time enemy, Mr. Conkling, widened a breach which was first opened on the floor of the national house in April 1866, and which ended in a tragedy.



NELSON DINGLEY JR.—1882.
MEMBER OF CONGRESS.

President Hayes' administration failed to unite the party; the resumption of specie payments in 1879, however, tending to redeem it before the business world. President Hayes did not seek a re-nomination. The people wanted Mr. Blaine; but again his old antagonist, using General Grant as a club, defeated him. The triumvirate of stalwarts—Conkling, Cameron and Logan—for thirty-five ballots held their forces with only one object in view, the defeat of Mr. Blaine. Mr. Blaine was defeated, but the nomination was given to James A. Garfield by Mr. Blaine himself, who advised such a course. The nomination was a fortunate one, and for the time being united the party. But after Garfield's election, the old fight between the factions broke out anew. President Garfield's selection of Blaine as secretary of state, intended as a graceful tribute to a great man and to one who had brought about the former's nomination, aroused still more bitterly the enmity of Conkling and his following. President Garfield also further antagonized Mr. Conkling by refusing to accede to the doctrine that the principal federal offices in a state should be disposed of according to the pleasure of the senators representing that state, without regard to the president's own views and preferences. The president undoubtedly desired to heal the dissensions in the party, but was not willing that Mr. Conkling should be dictator. President Garfield was placed in a trying position. He was between two fires, but determined to maintain his own dignity and self respect. Between the factional strifes within the party and the star-route scandals, the president was hounded on every side. But he pursued a straightforward course with great determination, apparently ignoring the excitement and antagonism about him. Washington was a whirlpool of political agitation from the moment President Garfield was inaugurated. Upon this scene of strife and hatred, Guiteau—weak-minded and egotistical—entered. He had been a small politician and conceived the idea of applying for an office. Maddened by disappointment and influenced by the sensational articles in the newspapers, he laid in wait for President Garfield as he was passing through a depot in Washington, and with a pistol inflicted a deadly wound. President Garfield fell at the feet of Mr. Blaine, his friend and secretary of state. The President lingered for weeks and at last obtained rest.

Two months and a half after President Garfield breathed his last, Nelson Dingley Jr. began his career in congress. The nation was in mourning and the Republican party in the last throes of a bitter factional fight. He came as a peace-maker and wise coun-

seller—a statesman in the highest and broadest sense. His field of action was not limited to party—it was humanity. As a warm personal friend of Mr. Blaine, he sought to heal the wounds of political strife. He advised Mr. Blaine to enter President Garfield's cabinet; he now advised him to retire from President Arthur's cabinet, so that time might soften the asperities of the hour and bring about a reconciliation of the factions whose mad career death had arrested. Mr. Blaine retired from public life temporarily, as Mr. Dingley re-entered. The defeat of Judge Folger, President Arthur's candidate for governor of New York by 192,000 majority, was the last act in the drama. Another era of "good feeling" began. It was a favorable time for calm, constructive legislators to begin work. There was promise of good results.

The forty-seventh congress assembled Monday, December 5, 1881. In the lower house were Hilary A. Herbert of Alabama, a confederate veteran and secretary of the navy under President Cleveland; Joseph Wheeler of Alabama, also a confederate veteran and a major-general of volunteers in the war with Spain; James K. Jones of Arkansas, subsequently United States senator and chairman of the national Democratic committee; William S. Rosecrans of California, a veteran of the civil war; Alexander H. Stephens of Georgia, vice president of the southern confederacy; Thomas J. Henderson of Illinois, a distinguished lawyer; William M. Springer, subsequently appointed a United States judge in Oklahoma; Joseph G. Cannon, who had already served four terms in the lower house and has served continuously ever since, with the exception of the fifty-second congress; William R. Morrison of Illinois, a distinguished Democratic leader; William Holman of Indiana, the great economist and "objector"; John A. Kasson of Iowa, who held several important positions in the foreign service of the United States and who is now reciprocity commissioner under the tariff act of 1897; William P. Hepburn of Iowa, who was serving his first term in the house and who subsequently took high rank as a legislator; J. Proctor Knott of Kentucky, whose fame rests upon an extravaganza of political oratory; John G. Carlisle of Kentucky, a distinguished Democratic leader, speaker of the house and secretary of the treasury under President Cleveland; J. C. S. Blackburn of Kentucky, subsequently United States Senator; Thomas B. Reed of Maine, an intellectual giant and subsequently speaker of the house; W. W. Crapo and George D. Robinson of Massachusetts, both governors of that commonwealth; J. C. Bur-

rows of Michigan, afterwards United States senator; Roswell G. Horr of Michigan, who was the wag of the house; Richard P. Bland of Missouri, called "Silver Dick," because of his advocacy of the free coinage of the silver dollar; Samuel S. Cox of New York, known as "Sunset" Cox and the wit of the house; Abram S. Hewitt of New York, subsequently mayor of New York city and a man of marked ability; Roswell P. Flower, afterwards governor of New York; Frank Hiscock of New York, subsequently United States senator; Benjamin Butterworth, afterwards commissioner of patents and a man of great intellectual force; William McKinley Jr. of Ohio, who was serving his third term in the house, was elected president of the United States in 1896, re-elected in 1900 and assassinated at Buffalo, New York, September 6, 1901; Samuel J. Randall of Pennsylvania, the distinguished protection Democrat; William D. Kelley, the apostle of protection, known as "Pig Iron" Kelley; Andrew G. Curtin, Pennsylvania's war governor; Benton McMillin of Tennessee, who served for many years with distinguished ability in the house and who in 1898 was chosen governor of Tennessee.

The candidates for speaker of the house were Messrs. Hiscock of New York, Keifer of Ohio, Kasson of Iowa, Dunnell of Minnesota, Orth of Indiana and Reed of Maine. Burrows of Michigan was among those mentioned, but it was announced that he would withdraw from the race and give his support to Hiscock of New York. However his name was presented at the Republican caucus. The old Conkling-Blaine quarrel again put in its appearance, notwithstanding the subduing influence of death; and the stalwarts entered upon the scene supporting Keifer of Ohio. Don Cameron, John A. Logan and others, who loyally stood by Grant in the memorable convention of 1880, manipulated the votes of the house for Keifer. A secret conference was held at Cameron's residence and Judge Kelley of Pennsylvania was promised the chairmanship of the ways and means committee if he would swing Pennsylvania to Keifer. But the shrewd Pennsylvanian was not to be thus caught. He was sure of that committee place in any event. This move of the stalwarts caused a concentration of forces on the other side, and Hiscock and Kasson combined. On the night of December 2nd, the day before the Republican caucus, a conference of Reed's supporters was held in Mr. Reed's room. Mr. Dingley was present offering his sound advice and valuable suggestions. Mr. Reed, after an intimate acquaintance for twenty years, had learned to respect and weigh carefully Mr. Dingley's opinions.

The Republican caucus was held December 3rd. Keifer was nominated on the sixteenth ballot, but not until after much sharp discussion and personal wrangling. Sixteen votes from Hiscock, ten from Burrows and six from Kasson nominated Keifer. Randall of Pennsylvania was nominated for speaker by the Democrats.


Speaker Keifer, in his address to the house, pointed to the singular fact that "at this most prosperous time in our nation no party in either branch of congress has an absolute majority over all other parties," and that "at no other time since and for many years prior to the accession of Abraham Lincoln to the executive chair has there been so few unsettled vital questions of a national character in relation to which party lines have been so closely drawn." It was a matter of national congratulation, he said, that the material prosperity of the people was in advance of any other period; it is a matter of congratulation to the Republican party that the violence of party spirit had materially subdued in great measure, because many of the reasons for its existence were gone.

The election of J. Warren Keifer as speaker of the house was a triumph of the stalwarts and did not tend to bring peace. The speaker's address to the house, however, was conservative and conciliatory; but the promises he was obliged to make to secure his election destroyed his influence as a speaker and finally accomplished his political ruin. He was in the hands of the stalwart leaders, but "out of joint" with the great majority of his party. It was a complete transfer of the country to the stalwart faction of the dominant party. Robeson of New Jersey succeeded Garfield and displaced Kasson on the floor. The west was disgruntled.

Before the drawing of the seats began, Mr. Page of California, moved that "William D. Kelley, the senior member of the house be allowed to select his seat before the regular drawing begins."

Mr. Townsend of Illinois amended the motion by stating that "there is a gentleman on this side of the house who served in this house for a number of years before Mr. Kelley became a member, and I ask that he also be permitted to select his seat in advance of the drawing." Several members shouted, "Who is he?" "S. S. Cox of New York," replied Mr. Townsend. Mr. Reed of Maine then drawled out in rasping voice: "It seems we had better not issue any preferred stock at all;" and both Mr. Kelley and Mr. Cox were denied the privilege.

In the drawing of seats it is interesting to note that General Wheeler was the first name to be called. Mr. Randall fared badly in the choice of seats, and Mr. Wheeler resigned his seat to the



HAMILTON HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D. C.
SUMMER HOME, SQUIRREL ISLAND, MAINE.
HOME IN LEWISTON, MAINE, WHILE GOVERNOR.
HOME IN LEWISTON, MAINE, WHILE CONGRESSMAN.

gentleman from Pennsylvania. Mr. Cox, the Democratic leader from New York, was also unfortunate in the lottery of seats, and again Mr. Wheeler resigned his seat, this time to Mr. Cox, himself retiring to that portion of the chamber known as "Sleepy Hollow." Mr. Dingley was lucky in the choice of seats, having fifth choice. He took seat number 24 on the Republican side—a position of advantage.

More than the ordinary curiosity and interest awaited the appearance of President Arthur's message, on account of the tragic events which elevated him to office. It was positive in its statements, and did not attempt to evade recommendations, or take refuge in diplomacy. "To that mysterious exercise of His will which has taken from us the loved and illustrious citizen who was but lately the head of the nation," said President Arthur, "we bow in sorrow and submission. The memory of his exalted character, of his noble achievements, and of his patriotic life will be treasured forever as a sacred possession of the whole people."

The fame of Mr. Dingley as an advocate of temperance and prohibition had preceded him. His honest and consistent course in his own state had attracted the attention of temperance workers elsewhere. It was not strange, therefore, that he was invited, the first Sunday after his arrival in Washington, to address the Dasha-way Reform club of that city. There was an unusually large attendance at that Sunday evening meeting, and Mr. Dingley's telling address was received attentively and earnestly. He detailed the success of the prohibitory law in Maine. He stated that "in the cities he had the honor of representing, with thirty thousand inhabitants, not one open drinking saloon can be found." The Maine law was said by some to be a failure. Mr. Dingley said: "I would be glad to know of such failures all over the country." He then drew a beautiful picture of himself, at the age of seven years, sitting at his mother's knee, having the total abstinence pledge explained to him and his signing it, never to be broken to that day. "The memory of that pledge," said he, "made to my mother, has been my guiding star through all the temptations of life."

Mr. Dingley first met President Arthur December 10 when he called upon him at the White House. The president received him graciously but rather nervously. The resignation of Secretary Blaine had been accepted and his successor determined upon. As somebody expressed it at that time, "President Arthur may be going slowly, but his pathway is as sure and leads in but one di-

rection." The president was anxious to have Secretary Blaine retire from the cabinet, and the latter knew it. Two days after Mr. Dingley called upon the president, Frederick Frelinghuysen was nominated to succeed Mr. Blaine as secretary of state. The nomination was confirmed by the senate, and a week later Mr. Blaine attended his last cabinet meeting. When Mr. Blaine arose to go, the president stepped forward and taking his hand between his own, held it in silence for a moment before he spoke. Mr. Blaine then quietly retired. Thus closed his short but brilliant career as secretary of state—too short for the nation's honor and glory. Whatever Mr. Blaine, now a private citizen, might have reflected upon the course of events; what measure of sorrow and disappointment he may have harbored; he concealed all beneath a calm and dignified exterior. His enemies were no less bitter, but he sought no revenge. Fourteen years had elapsed since his first forensic encounter with Conkling, and time had effaced from his heart every vestige of personal animosity towards his old antagonist. Mr. Dingley shared Mr. Blaine's confidence at this time perhaps more than anybody in public life, and knew that the latter was a changed man from the moment that his friend and chief,¹ President Garfield, fell, pierced by an assassin's bullet. Mr. Dingley was appointed a member of the Garfield Memorial Committee which selected Mr. Blaine to deliver what was one of the most beautiful, touching and masterly eulogies ever pronounced in the nation's history. Into this address Mr. Blaine threw his whole soul. In it the country saw reflected the grand and noble side of Mr. Blaine himself. His most bitter enemies applauded. The political gladiators were brought face to face with death and eternity. As he closed with these words—"Let us think that his dying eyes read the mystic meaning which only the wrapt and parting soul may know; let us believe that in the silence of the receding world he heard the great waves breaking on a farther shore, and felt already upon his wasted brow the breath of the eternal morning"—Mr. Blaine himself drew the curtain over the great tragedy and forgave all.

Mr. Dingley was appointed by Speaker Keifer second on the committee on banking and currency and a member of the select committee on alcoholic liquor traffic. Early in the session he presented a petition of the national Temperance society and twenty thousand Good Templars of Maine for a committee to investigate

1—Alexander Stephens of Georgia in advocating a Blaine eulogy, compared the relations of Garfield and Blaine to those of David and Jonathan.

the alcoholic liquor traffic. He followed this up with a bill for the creation of a commission on the alcoholic liquor traffic. Early in January he also introduced a bill to abolish the import duty on sugar and molasses. He said that "this would save the people fifty million dollars a year. If taxation can be reduced, free sugar is much to be preferred to free whiskey."

Hon. William E. Dodge of New York and A. M. Powell of New Jersey, representing the national temperance society, appeared before the alcoholic traffic committee and advocated the bill presented by Mr. Dingley to appoint a commission to investigate the liquor traffic in its relations to the public welfare. To strengthen the cause, a temperance conference under the auspices of the National Temperance Publication society of New Jersey was held in Washington January 24. Here Mr. Dingley made a strong and stirring address. In the course of an argument before the committee, Mr. Schade, representing the brewers' interests, made certain statements respecting prohibition in Vermont and Maine which Mr. Joyce of Vermont and Mr. Dingley corrected, presenting statistics to show the incorrectness of Mr. Schade's conclusions. Mr. Dingley suggested to Mr. Schade, that the fact that he (Schade) and the brewers' association differed widely from a great majority of the people of Maine as to the actual results of the Maine law, was in itself a conclusive argument in favor of a careful investigation and ascertainment of the truth. "If Mr. Schade really believes that his statistics represent the actual facts" added Mr. Dingley, "he ought to be foremost in asking for an impartial official investigation in order that he (Schade) may have a demonstration of the correctness of his views."

The report ¹ presented in the house by Mr. Dingley on January 30th, and ordered printed, argued that "congress has an appropriate jurisdiction over such an investigation as this; that any investigation to be of value must be national and cover the whole union; that the private investigations heretofore made have been necessarily partial and unreliable; that it is the duty of congress to secure all possible light as to the proper treatment of the gravest problem of the age; that congress itself requires such light to guide its revenue legislation and its direct and supervisory legislation over the traffic in the District of Columbia and the territories; and that the prayers of the largest number of petitioners in every state and territory of the union which ever asked for any measure cannot be wisely or justly disregarded."

1—See Appendix.

The editors of the Boston Congregationalist wrote Mr. Dingley asking him to give the readers of that paper some of the benefits which the friends of temperance hoped to reap from an investigation by the proposed alcoholic commission. Mr. Dingley's reply was published in full by the Congregationalist. The results, he said, would be first, comprehensive, accurate and well digested statistics of the liquor traffic, and its effects on the economic, moral and social interests of the people; second, to settle the true moral basis of temperance reform; third, decisive statistics and facts as to the comparative practical results of the prohibitory and the license policy of legislative dealing with the temptations of the dram shop; fourth, the drink problem in its relation to material waste, pauperism, disease, crime and the social and moral welfare of the people.

January 19th, the committee on banking and currency by a vote of nine to two adopted Mr. Dingley's proposition for extending the charter of national banks. A sub-committee consisting of Messrs. Crapo of Massachusetts, Dingley of Maine and Hardenberg of New Jersey was appointed to draft a bill extending the charters of national banks twenty years. April 12 Mr. Dingley made a report¹ from this committee on the question of taxation by the states of legal tender notes. An attempt was made in committee to report a bill to abolish the tax on deposits of banks and bankers. This proposition was opposed by Mr. Dingley and defeated in committee. Mr. Dingley took the ground that while he believed the national banking system to be the wisest and best that could be devised, nevertheless he thought that banks and bankers should pay a just tax for all their privileges. He thought there was no just ground to relieve them from a just tax on their deposits, which afford the most profitable part of their business, and especially so with the wealthy city banks.

Mr. Dingley began his great movement in behalf of the shipping interests of America by offering a resolution of inquiry as to consular fees, etc., with a view of ascertaining if this were not one of the needless burdens imposed on American shipping. An answer to the inquiry showed that "during the last fiscal year the fees and charges collected by consular officers from American shipping in foreign ports amounted to \$122,198, about one-quarter of which was for tonnage dues and \$18,000 of which were extra wages of seamen, that is, the three months advance required by law for seamen discharged in foreign ports. Most of this revenue

1—See Appendix.



U. S. GRANT. W. S. ROSECRANS.
N. P. BANKS. JOSEPH WHEELER.

constituted a needless burden on American shipping engaged in the foreign trade, and like similar burdens on other branches of commerce, its cost was by no means fully represented by its amounts.

Mr. Dingley was appointed chairman of a sub-committee on banking and currency to consider all bills referred to the committee relative to silver certificates. April 18 a report was made to the full committee. Early in June he made a report,¹ from the banking and currency committee on the silver question which attracted much attention and which was pronounced by Abram S. Hewitt of New York, one of the ablest presentations of the silver question ever made to congress.

Speaker Keifer found many thorns in his pathway early in the session. Mr. Orth of Indiana made a sensational speech on the 5th of January, against the injustice of the selection of committees and particularly his own assignments. He said that the "speaker in his recent action has done an injustice to me and my constituents." George M. Robeson of New Jersey was Speaker Keifer's lieutenant on the floor of the house. But he did not possess the confidence of the members, suffering with the speaker from the suspicion of stalwart influence amounting to dictation. The speaker and his floor leader, finding their influence impaired, sought to regain it by enlarging the membership of the committees. January 17 Mr. Robeson reported a resolution from the committee on rules increasing the membership of thirteen standing committees. The debate which followed for three successive days was sharp and acrimonious. It gave the disgruntled members an opportunity to air their grievances. But Mr. Reed and Mr. Kelley doubted the wisdom of enlarging the committees. Mr. Dingley was convinced that the proposition was unwise and twice voted to lay the whole matter on the table. The debate finally degenerated into a farce. Mr. Horr of Michigan was, next to Mr. Cox of New York, the wag of the house. He caught from the speech of Mr. Thomas of Illinois something about "a camel to carry over the deserts of congress the burden of appropriations for the cat-fish sloughs and trout-brooks which congressmen desire to secure." Then standing far back in the center of the middle aisle, his fat jolly face wreathed in merriment, Horr said if the proposed amendment was adopted "that camel will not stand the heat of debate in the house for two days. The third day he will find his animal wind broken, and be-

1—See Appendix.

fore it reached the end of its journey it would be wind-broken and spavined. * * * The next thing someone else would propose a committee on the Atlantic coast, then another one for the improvement of our inland lakes upon where I live, then another of my friend's old acquaintances—what was that Pennsylvania creek?" turning his head inquiringly.

Mr. Cox of New York—"Kiskiminetas."

Mr. Horr—"Yes, a committee on the Kiskiminetas."

By this time the house was in an uproar of laughter. Mr. Horr continued: "Whence, then, comes this trouble about these committees? I should just as soon try to find out who struck Billy Patterson as to answer that question. Admitting that the trouble is that some members feel sore over committee appointments, the next question is, is this plaster proposed by the committee on rules large enough to cover the sore? You will only tear open the old sore and the next thing you know proud flesh will get in, and then where are you? Gangrene follows, and then death." The members fairly shook with laughter and it became evident that the proposition of the committee on rules would be hopelessly lost. The speaker listened with a stern and troubled face. Mr. Robeson, his lieutenant, attempted to stem the tide of mingled opposition and ridicule, but to no avail. On the 19th the resolution by a vote of ninety to forty three, was re-committed to the committee. It was an ignominious defeat for Speaker Keifer.

Dartmouth college has always had a vigorous alumni association, and at its annual reunion January 18th, the centenary of Webster's birthday, Mr. Dingley, one of its most distinguished graduates, responded for the class of 1855. His toast was, "It is, sir, as I have said, a small college, and yet there are those who love it. Sir, I know not how others feel, but myself, when I see my alma mater surrounded like Caesar in the senate house, by those who reiterated stab upon stab, I would not for this right hand have her turn to me and say, 'Et tu quoque mi fili'—and thou too my son."

The trial of Guiteau, the foul slayer of President Garfield, had been in progress since the middle of November. It had aroused many of the old personal antagonisms and brought to public attention all the harrowing details of a tragedy that formed a chapter in recent political history. It had an effect on the course of politics, furnishing fuel for the embers that were still smouldering. Therefore, when Guiteau, on the 25th of January was pronounced guilty, there was an outburst of applause in the court room that

found a glad and responsive echo in the hearts of many political leaders. The condemned man's curses and imprecations shocked a nation; and when on the last day of June Guiteau was executed, there was a manifest sigh of relief.

The enemies of Mr. Blaine followed him to private life. They charged that when secretary of state, he inaugurated a policy of "jingoism" that would have brought the nation into serious difficulty, if not war, had not fate and an assassin intervened. But Mr. Blaine sharply retaliated in a public letter explanatory and defensive of his course while in charge of foreign affairs, touching our relations with Chili and Peru. Mr. Blaine's position was abandoned by Secretary Frelinghuysen. The former wanted to secure a trade footing in the South American republics. He thought it folly to allow all the South American ports to be closed against us by England and wanted to save Peru from annihilation by Chili and prevent Great Britain's domination in South America. Mr. Blaine's position was that of opposition to the extension of British influence upon this continent. He was in favor of a complete restoration of American trade and commerce with the Sandwich Islands, Mexico, and the South American republics. In a letter dated November 29, Mr. Blaine had urged upon President Arthur the importance of a congress of American republics. He wrote: "I do not say, Mr. President, that the holding of a peace congress will necessarily change the currents of trade, but it will bring us into kindly relations with all the American nations."

As if to make the gulf between the factions all the wider, President Arthur surprised the whole country by nominating Senator Conkling to be associate justice of the United States supreme court. President Grant had offered the same position to Conkling but the latter declined it. In the senate a motion to immediately confirm the nomination was objected to by Senator Hoar who believed "he had used his powers for bad purposes," and added: "I do not believe he is honest. His elevation [excitedly pounding his desk] would be a disgrace to the judicial ermine." Mr. Hoar reviewed the fact that when the name of Stanley Matthews was sent in by President Garfield, Conkling refused to extend the usual courtesy to a senator and took occasion to parade his wrongs at the hands of the administration, reflecting upon President Garfield. The New York Tribune bitterly assailed Conkling and quoted what Conkling had said when Robertson was nominated: "Send him abroad to some second-hand consulship and I will go into the lobby and hold my nose while he is confirmed." Mr.


Conkling settled the controversy by declining to accept the appointment. He would not have been confirmed by the senate, for the friends of Mr. Blaine in the senate had good memories. Thus waged the battle over Garfield's grave.

Mr. Dingley's gentle nature recoiled from these bitter personal and factional strifes. The harsh and cruel debates on the floor of the house; the flings of sarcasm; the coarse ribaldry witnessed by him at the very dawn of his congressional career, not only did not interest him, but actually repelled him. He stood upon a higher plane and was moved by nobler purposes; and when, on the 11th of February, the seventieth birthday of the venerable Alexander Stephens¹ of Georgia, was gracefully and touchingly remembered by his associates, the incident seemed like a benediction.

Mr. Dingley's attention was directed more to the business of the house and the country than to factional quarrels or the vindication of personal honor. His very first appearance in debate, on the first of March, was in opposition to a resolution to create another office—a clerkship in the house. The whole matter was sent back to the committee. This incident simply illustrates how watchful he was of the people's interest from the beginning.

The situation in the house grew worse and worse under the administration of Speaker Keifer and Mr. Robeson. The correspondent of the Boston Journal wrote: "Unfortunately the organization of the house has resulted in what is almost a paralysis of business. Scarcely a single report from a committee has been ratified by the house. Never was there such a lapse of those parliamentary leaders of which Mr. Blaine spoke. The Democrats are much better organized, especially for purposes of defense and obstruction. The indefinite postponement of the tariff commission, by consent of the ways and means committee, is a good illustration of the apathy and lack of method which prevails." The country

1—Alexander Stephens of Georgia was elected to the Georgia legislature in 1837 and served seven years in both houses. He was first chosen to congress in 1843, serving until 1859, declining a re-election. He was vice president of the confederacy, and re-entered congress in 1873. Few men ever served as many years as Mr. Stephens, consecutively. Garfield was elected to congress nine consecutive times. Lewis Williams of North Carolina, the father of the house in his day, served in fourteen congresses, from December 14, 1815, until his death in Washington February 23, 1842. Nathaniel Macon, the strict, severe and stringent North Carolina Democrat was twelve times successively elected to the house and was then elected to the senate. J. Q. Adams, after having been president, senator and foreign minister, was elected to the twenty-second congress as a Whig, and consecutively elected eight times, dying in office in the speaker's room February 23, 1848. Churchill C. Chamberling, a New York Democrat, was elected nine times to the house, serving from 1821 to 1836. Joshua R. Giddings, almost the immediate predecessor of Garfield, was elected by the western reserves, serving from the 25th to the 36th congresses. Elihu B. Washburn was elected nine times from the state of Illinois while William D. Kelley was elected eleven times consecutively.



JAS. A. GARFIELD. CHESTER A. ARTHUR.
ROSCOE CONKLING. J. WARREN KEIFER.



at this time was ripe for tariff revision. On the 30th of November, 1881, a tariff convention had been held in the city of New York. At this convention Former Governor Grinnell of Iowa voiced the sentiment of the people when he said: "Fernando Wood is dead. I don't thank God for that, but I do thank God that he will never again be chairman of the ways and means committee. I believe he has gone to a good home, and I hope he has changed from a free-trader to a protectionist." The committee on ways and means delayed until the 8th day of February before reporting to the house its bill for the creation of a tariff commission. It came up for discussion March 7th, and was postponed indefinitely, on a point of order, to the chagrin of the leaders of the house. However, on the 28th of March, the bill was taken up under a special order.

For twenty years, subject to some slight modifications, the country had been conducting its business under the same tariff laws. The changed condition of the business of the country necessitated changes in the tariff. Attempts had been made in the forty-fourth, forty-fifth and forty-sixth congresses to revise the tariff, but all failed. The bill now before the house provided for the appointment of a commission by the president to investigate all the facts relating to the subject of the tariff and report to congress the following December. Mr. Kasson of Iowa, made an able and exhaustive speech in support of the measure. Mr. Carlisle replied to Mr. Kasson in one of the ablest speeches on that side of the tariff question that has ever been delivered in the house of representatives. "I believe," he said, "the tariff and other economic questions are coming rapidly to the front and will constitute the great and controlling questions in the politics of the future." Mr. Hewitt of New York, a practical business man, followed in a speech no less brilliant. April 6th, Mr. McKinley of Ohio, made his famous speech on the tariff question, thus for the first time attracting public attention and taking the initial step towards the White House. It was in this speech that Mr. McKinley encountered Mr. Hewitt, the "little giant" of the low tariff school, one of the great triumvirate of the Democratic free-trade leaders in this congress—Carlisle, Randall and Hewitt.

The tariff debate continued with varying interest. It was a battle of intellectual giants. The industrial and material progress of the country was viewed in retrospect through protection and free-trade lens. The facts seemed to be undisputed; but the conclusions were radically different. On the 15th of April Mr. McMillin of Tennessee, in his tariff speech bristling with ancient and

modern history, references to apostolic days and ancient lore, fact and fiction, charged that protection had driven American shipping from the ocean. This was Mr. Dingley's opportunity; and on the 25th of April he made his first great speech in the house on "Protection of American Shipping."¹ It was a masterly effort—keen, logical, clear and convincing. He brought forth from the pages of history incontrovertible facts to establish his conclusions. He argued that it was free trade and not protection that had destroyed our foreign carrying trade, and that protection was necessary to restore the foreign carrying trade to its old-time glory. He was frequently interrupted by the Democratic leaders but held his own against them all. His time was extended and his address listened to attentively. One by one he destroyed the "free-ship" and "free-trade" structures, establishing in their places a sound and enduring policy that could not be shaken. As he proceeded the indifference which had been manifested toward this new member from Maine, changed into marked interest. Members stopped talking and quietly moved nearer the speaker. "I only repeat the teachings of history," he said, "when I say that no people ever became a great commercial nation that did not build their own ships. The Egyptians, the Greeks, the Italians, the Carthaginians, the Spaniards, and the Dutch held in turn the empire of the sea; but each only so long as they could build their own vessels. When our carrying trade was thrown open to the world by the civil war, England, France and Germany wanted it; but the former secured it simply because she could and did build her own ships. Experience has shown that a nation which does not build her ships will not long have the ability to buy them after the door is opened. The nation which confesses its inability to devise any policy by which it may build its own ships, and deliberately sends its people into the market to buy of her neighbors, surrenders her independence, and in war places herself at the mercy of those nations which control the ocean. * * * Mr. Chairman, important as are other questions before this congress, I hold that not one of them is of greater importance and of more far-reaching consequence than this. We are already a republic of more than fifty millions, and increasing in population and wealth never before known in the history of any other nation. In 1890 our population will reach sixty-five millions, and in 1910 it will reach one hundred millions, provided we are true to ourselves and our destinies. But unless all history is misleading, we cannot hope to retain our present advantages or to extend

1—See Appendix.

our prestige as a nation, unless by an efficient system of protection and encouragement, we hold and strengthen our position on the sea as we have on the land. As has been well said, the throne of empire rests no less on the rocking waves than on the solid land."

At the close of his address, the members on both sides of the house vigorously applauded and personally extended congratulations. The future leader of the house had scored his first triumph, and for an hour or more the old leaders on both sides discussed in the lobby and cloak rooms the great speech of the black-haired member from Maine. Some of them in recent years have recalled with pleasure their recollections of Mr. Dingley's first great triumph on the floor of the house. The Washington Star pronounced it "a speech of much ability and force, giving promise of a successful career in congress;" and the Washington correspondent of the New York Tribune said it was "one of the best speeches ever made by a new member."

In discussing the bill to appoint a tariff commission Mr. Dingley said: "The protectionists, mainly Republicans, take the ground that in framing a tariff, care should be taken to so impose duties as not only to secure revenue, but also, to protect American industries against the competition of the products of similar industries in foreign countries, where the wages of labor are less than here. Protection is for the benefit of the farmer as well as the manufacturer and laborer. No country can be prosperous without manufactures and diversified industries. It has been shown by the experience of the world that nations purely agricultural, are weak and dependent nations. The nation which raises its food, makes its clothing, and produces as near as possible all that is essential to its prosperity, is the most prosperous. Farming is the most prosperous alongside of manufactures and commerce."

Returning from his triumph in the house, Mr. Dingley that same evening, attended a Congregational convention and made a scholarly address on "Temperance and Christianity."

It is a significant and important fact that the Republicans of the house wherein Mr. Dingley served his first term, refused to reduce the internal revenue tax on whiskey. Lobbyists labored hard for the bill, but to no avail; and the injunction of Mr. Dingley—"remove the tax from sugar and not from whiskey"—was observed in the Republican caucus. In this caucus the voice of Mr. Dingley was raised in behalf of the cause of temperance.

In the month of March, the last lingering attempts were made to defame the martyred Garfield. An anonymous letter appeared in

the public press in which Garfield was referred to as a "treacherous, cowardly and hypocritical man." This letter was inspired by some angered and disappointed stalwart; but its publication did not have the desired effect. It rather caused a revolt among the stalwarts themselves, arousing mingled anger and jealousy; and when on the first day of April it was decided by the administration leaders to force the nomination of Secretary of the Treasury Charles J. Folger for governor of New York, there were signs of an approaching storm. Judge Folger was buried out of sight at the polls and the stalwarts disappeared as a political factor. Realizing the feeling that was slowly but surely being aroused, President Arthur with rare political shrewdness, drew upon the ranks of the old followers of Mr. Blaine to complete his cabinet. He made William E. Chandler secretary of the navy, and Henry M. Teller secretary of the interior. Chandler was an ardent Blaine man, and his appointment visibly strengthened President Arthur's position.

Debate on the bill to extend the charters of national banks began in the house May 13. Mr. Crapo¹ of Massachusetts, chairman of the committee on banking and currency, led off in a strong speech. Mr. Bland of Missouri, the silver apostle, spoke against the bill. In the course of his speech Mr. Bland intimated that the national banking interest had forced the committee on banking and currency to report out a bill which practically demonetized silver. Mr. Dingley in reply said: "Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Missouri has made certain representations in reference to a

1—Mr. Crapo writes to the editor of these volumes: "My acquaintance with Mr. Dingley began when he entered congress in 1881. Although a new member, serving his first term, he at once attracted attention. He was placed on the committee of banking and currency of which I was then chairman. At the outset he took a prominent part in the discussions and work of the committee. He had prepared himself by an exhaustive and intelligent study of the history of banking from its earliest periods, and his command of facts and figures in illustration and defence of his position was quite remarkable. He delighted in statistics and made use of them with great readiness and accuracy. In the committee room Mr. Dingley was fond of disputation, and nothing pleased him more than an earnest argument with the fiat money and the free-silver members of the committee. His industry was unsurpassed. No amount of work or investigation could be assigned to him which he did not welcome. Yet such was his method of application he never appeared weary or over-taxed. He reached his conclusions by logical reasoning, working out the solution with intense earnestness and entire sincerity. No man in congress enjoyed in greater degree the confidence and respect of his associates. Whatever statement he made in debate was accepted as accurate and reliable. His strict adherence to facts and his fair and courteous treatment of opponents won their hearty esteem. While he was genial and approachable and prompt to render assistance and advice, there was an abundance of humor and levity. The trivialities of life did not interest him. Doubtless he had recreations, but as I saw and knew him his pleasure was in indefatigable, persistent, tireless investigation of economic problems. The continuance of the national banking system by the extension of the corporate existence of the banks was fiercely resisted in the forty-seventh congress both by the advocates of a greenback and the advocates of a silver currency. Mr. Dingley took an active part in the contest and his efforts and influence largely contributed to the success of sound banking legislation."

bill reported by a majority of the committee on banking and currency in relation to the coinage of the silver dollar, I deem it proper to correct his statements. He represented that the national banks through a majority of the banking and currency committee, had contrived a bill to demonetize the standard silver dollar and to take away from the people that dollar."

"I have shown," said Mr. Bland, "that the demand for the demonetization of silver comes from the national bank interests."

"I wish to show," replied Mr. Dingley, "that the bill reported by the majority of the committee with reference to the coinage of the silver dollar, simply provides that coinage shall be limited to the demands of the people. Its sole purpose is to prevent the accumulation of silver dollars in the treasury which the people do not want. I agree with the gentleman that it is the people who should determine the amount of coinage of the silver dollar, and they will indicate their wants by the demand they make for them at the treasury. Now what has been the demand of the people for the silver dollar? On the first day of January there were in circulation thirty-five and one-half million silver dollars. Since that time we have coined nine million, and have paid out over half of them, and over half of those paid out have come back to the treasury and accumulated there. More than that, Mr. Speaker, of the thirty-five and a half million dollars that were in circulation on the first day of January, three and one-half millions have also been returned to the treasury and are there today. Thus we have accumulated in the treasury since the first day of January twelve and a half million dollars that the people do not want."

The colloquy was, perhaps, premature and irrelevant; but it brought out the fact that Mr. Bland misconstrued the action of the committee on banking and currency of which Mr. Dingley was a member. Mr. Hewitt of New York, one of the ablest of the Democrats, and Mr. Butterworth of Ohio, one of the ablest of the Republicans, spoke at length, the former against and the latter in favor of the bill. The debate covered every phase of the national bank question, and brought forth widely divergent views. On the 17th of May Mr. Dingley took the floor and spoke on the broad question of national banks and the national banking system.¹ He said in opening that "while some objections have been advanced which merit thoughtful consideration, yet the burden of the assaults on this system have consisted not so much of candid arguments as of extravagant or unfounded assertions and violent de-

1—See Appendix.


nunciatory phrases in which 'monopoly,' 'swindle' and 'robbery' have played a conspicuous part." He then carefully reviewed the history of the national banking system, the opposition of the state banks, the success of the system itself, the profits of circulation; pointed out that the system was not limited to the public debt, dissected the greenback program, the non-legal tender note plan, discussed the question of profit and loss to national banks, the tax on depositors, dissipated the monopoly objection and the popular notion that the circulation medium belongs to the nation, discussed the query who shall control the volume of money, touched upon the danger of inflation by government notes, asserted that the treasury was not responsive to wants of trade and explained the redemption of government notes. He concluded by pointing out the teachings of history, the warnings of our statesmen and the views of Jefferson and other Democrats and said: "It would be worse than a blunder for the American congress to destroy the national banking system which is so closely interwoven with the business of the country, and which is inspiring so complete confidence in business circles, and commit the country to a currency experiment which every authority in economic science, the fathers of the republic and the stern teachings of experience warn us to avoid."

This speech was regarded as so able and satisfactory a discussion of the national banking system, that it was reprinted by the Republican congressional committee and widely circulated as a campaign document.


The house passed the tariff commission bill on the 6th day of May and the bill extending national bank charters thirteen days later. Both measures were denounced by the Democrats.

June 6th, Mr. Dingley made a report from the banking and currency committee on the "silver question" which attracted much attention and which was pronounced by Mr. Hewitt of New York one of the ablest presentations of the silver question ever made in congress. ¹ The bill accompanying the report provided that until an international agreement on a coinage ratio for the use of silver in full legal tender coinage shall be made by the leading commercial nations, or until the equivalency of bullion between the standard silver and gold coins of the United States in the markets of the world shall be otherwise secured, the issue of silver certificates shall be suspended, providing the silver certificates now outstanding may from time to time as paid into the treasury be re-issued on the de-

1—See Appendix.



W. H. MORRISON. ABRAM S. HEWITT.
HILARY A. HERBERT. WM. M. SPRINGER.



posit of silver dollars. The bill further provided that until the agreement above indicated is reached, the secretary of the treasury shall cause to be coined only such number of the standard silver dollars as may be required to supply the demand for actual circulation, in lieu of the minimum coinage provided for in the act of February 28th, 1878. The Greenback papers of Maine denounced the bill and the report, charging that "Mr. Dingley is a bank director, and his bill is in the interest of the banks." Mr. Dingley replied, denying that he was a bank director or the holder of any bank stock. After disposing of some of the objections raised, he observed: "But the greatest objection to the unlimited coinage of silver dollars worth intrinsically less than eighty cents as compared with the gold dollar, is that it will finally force us to a silver basis, and drive gold from the country. At present the eleven cents difference between the silver and the gold dollars, is bridged over by receiving the former for gold duty. This will answer when the volume of silver dollars and certificates is small; but will utterly fail if the coinage goes on many years longer, and would fail at once if we should have unlimited coinage as the silver lunatics propose, and have introduced a bill into congress to do. This is seen by every eminent bimetallist, and every authority in finance."

June 5th Mr. Dingley introduced a bill to provide for the issue of gold certificates. It authorized the secretary of the treasury to receive deposits of gold coin and bullion with the treasurer or assistant treasurer, in sums not less than ten dollars, and to issue certificates therefor. The coin and bullion deposited for and representing the certificates of deposit were to be retained in the treasury for the payment of the same on demand and the certificates were to be receivable for customs, taxes and all public dues, and when so received might be re-issued, and when held by any banking association might be counted as part of its lawful reserve and accepted in the settlement of its clearing house balances. This bill finally became a section of the silver bill.

When the deficiency appropriation bill was in the house (June 6th) a paragraph was reached appropriating \$32,000 for the expenses of the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown, Virginia. During the debate Mr. Cobb of Indiana obtained leave to print the items enumerated in the bill presented by the "Yorktown Centennial Celebration Commission," October 18, 1881. The bill was for \$6,500 worth of liquors, most of which was utilized in making the celebration "glorious." Mr. Dingley objected to the payment of this bill

and said: "The gentleman from New York (Mr. Hiscock) remarked a few moments ago that it was better that these transactions should remain in silence rather than be trumpeted abroad throughout the country. If they were not already known to the country; if every newspaper in the land had not already trumpeted this disgraceful affair, there might be some point to the suggestion." He then read a despatch to a Cincinnati paper, asserting that the officers in charge of the celebration were provided with liquors of all kinds and "Uncle Sam was footing the bills." Mr. Hewitt of New York thought there was a difference "between the arena of the newspapers and the floor of the house of representatives." Mr. Dingley continued in reply: "When such an uncontradicted charge as that which I have read is made against a committee of congress, and when it appears that they have used the money of the people to contract and pay such bills, it is time for the representatives of the people on this floor to proclaim in the house what everybody outside knows, and to protest against it. And I stand here to protest in the name of my constituents and I believe in the name of this country, against foisting upon the taxpayers of this country the payment of a bill like this, incurred under the plea of extending a welcome to twenty gentlemen from France. I call upon the representatives of the people not to counsel silence when it is proposed to pay such bills from the public treasury, but to speak out words of truth; for unless they are spoken, unless we protest against such a proceeding as this, we shall find the evil increasing from year to year." These brave words were re-echoed in every christian and temperance home in the land.

Mr. Blaine had stepped from the political arena, but his political influence remained. So great was the regard of his old constituents, that they tendered him the nomination for representative in congress but he declined the same. He said: "For twenty-three years I was continuously in the public service and left in consequence of a tragedy that has involved deep changes in the policies of the government." More than this, he had given up all hope of being president of the United States, for two years before he publicly stated: "I will never make another organized effort to secure the nomination. If the nomination should come, I will be thankful, but I cannot go through another struggle and will not ask my friends to make the sacrifice." But his friends were willing to make the sacrifice; and in 1884 he was nominated for president by the Republicans but defeated by a narrow margin.

President Arthur appointed the following members of the tariff commission: William A. Wheeler of New York, John L. Hayes of Massachusetts, Henry W. Oliver Jr. of Pennsylvania, Austin M. Garland of Illinois, John Ambler of Ohio, John S. Phelps of Missouri, Robert P. Porter of the District of Columbia, John W. H. Underwood of Georgia, Duncan F. Kenner of Louisiana. Mr. Wheeler declined to serve and the place was offered to several gentlemen, all of whom also declined. Finally William H. McMahon of New York accepted. Mr. Phelps declined to serve and Alexander P. Boteler of West Virginia was nominated in his place. July 6th this commission, with not a few misgivings as to the result, assembled at the Ebbitt house and began its work.

The Maine Republican state convention was held in Portland, June 13th. Senator Frye was chairman of the state committee. Senator Hale, who presided over the convention, said he believed "President Arthur was trying to bring all shades of the party into accord." Frederick Robie was nominated for governor and Messrs. Reed, Dingley, Boutelle, and Milliken, for congressmen-at-large. Mr. Dingley did not attend this convention, but sent kind words of appreciation and greeting. He received every vote of the eleven hundred and eighty-one cast in the convention—a remarkable distinction. Daniel H. Thing was nominated by the fusionists of the second congressional district as the man "who is to warm the seat now occupied by Nelson Dingley Jr."

On the 15th of June, when the house in committee of the whole had under consideration the river and harbor bill, Mr. Cox of New York made one of his characteristic speeches; and this speech was quite the funniest that he had thus far delivered. He followed Mr. Horr of Michigan, his rival in wit and absurdity. "Mr. Chairman," said Mr. Cox with marked solemnity, "I have just looked over this bill and have failed to find one favorite stream. I do not mean the Kiskiminetas; that is 'gone to the rearward and abyss of time.' I pine for my favorite. Other streams also that used to be in these bills are gone. But one stream, of unpronounceable delight, I have failed to find in this bill. It touched my heart with peculiar tenderness. It deserved an appropriation. I have some poetry about it. It speaks of messages of love and joy and sorrow. I think my friend Judge Holman, when he hears this song, will move to amend the bill by putting this stream in." Then in the midst of roars of laughter, the clerk read Mr. Cox's original poem, entitled "the Skoodoowobskook."

"Oh! maid with the hair that is yellow,
'Tis time that your home you forsook;
Come over and live with a fellow,
By the beautiful Skoodoowobskook.

And there where the grasses of brooks kiss,
In the prettiest kind of a nook,
Where the swift running Skoodoowobskook is
Pours into the Skoodoowobskook.

Our lives their streams shall commingle,
For heaven no further will look;
Then come,—it is wrong to live single—
O come to the Skoodoowobskook.

In this lovely terrestrial Eden,
I'll teach you to fish with a hook,
The fishes are plenty, O maiden,
In the crystalline Skoodoowobskook..

Our food shall be trout from the waters,
Which you to your sweet taste shall cook;
Come, fairest of Uncle Sam's daughters,
To the banks of the Skoodoowobskook."

"I am glad," said Mr. Cox, "that our clerk has a fine appreciation of poetry. He not only reads it with credit to himself, but honor to the house and committee. I fail to find that stream in this bill. It is an outrage on the Skoodoowobskook. It is an outrage on the state of Maine, where I surmise it is situated. The gentleman from Maine (Mr. Dingley) who honors me with his attention, feels it enter his very heart!"

This good-natured thrust at the most sober and serious member of the house, himself overcome with laughter, fairly convulsed the house. But Mr. Dingley appreciated the sarcasm and wit of the member from New York.

Mr. Dingley first gave evidence in the house of his wonderfully accurate and comprehensive grasp of government finances and the tariff, on the 26th of June, when he made a speech in the committee of the whole on "Reduction of Taxation." The committee was considering a bill reported from the committee on ways and means to reduce internal revenue taxation. Mr. Dingley argued that as

far as possible taxes should be imposed on luxuries and made as light as possible on necessities when this taxation increased their cost. Liquors and tobacco he deemed luxuries to be taxed. "Five times," said Mr. Dingley, "since the war closed has the Republican party reduced taxation. But in making reduction, congress should be guided by the single purpose of aiding the masses and the industries of the country as far as possible, and in all indirect taxation, should make the burdens fall on the luxuries rather than the necessities of life." ¹ This speech was reprinted and circulated as a campaign document by the Republican congressional committee. June 27 the bill passed the house by a vote of 128 to 80, 83 not voting. Mr. Dingley voted "no," because the bill reduced the internal revenue tax on liquor and tobacco. He was in favor of that portion of the bill removing the stamp tax on checks, drafts, orders and vouchers; and removing certain taxes upon the capital and deposits of banks and bankers.

In the meantime the bill to enable national banking associations to extend their corporate existence, passed the senate with amendments, and came over to the house. Mr. Crapo, chairman of the committee on banking and currency, moved that the house insist on its disagreements to the amendments of the senate and ask for a conference. The speaker appointed Mr. Crapo, Mr. Dingley and Mr. Buckner as the house conferees. In this conference Mr. Dingley displayed his rare skill and diplomacy in adjusting differences of opinions so as to obtain the best possible results. For several days the conferees failed to agree. Finally through the persuasive efforts of Mr. Dingley, on the 10th of July, an agreement was reached and the conference report adopted by both houses. The bill ² thus became a law.

Mr. Dingley's district was bounded on the east by the Atlantic ocean; and along the shore were many important seaport towns, such as Bath, Boothbay, Rockland, and Camden. For years, Bath had been a great ship-building centre, and in the early days before the advent of iron and steel ships, the wooden ships of Bath were the pride of Maine and the glory of the nation in the leading ports of the world. But the foreign carrying trade of the United States was declining, and Mr. Dingley wanted the whole country to know why. His speech in the house on the 20th of April previous, had called the attention of the people to his knowledge of and decided views on, the situation. With a view to bringing about practical

1—See Appendix.

2—H. of R. Bill No. 4167.

results along this line, he introduced a joint resolution to provide for a commission to inquire into the condition of the ship-building and ship-owning interests of the United States and to suggest measures for restoring the foreign carrying trade of the United States. The fruitful result of this move was made manifest a few years later.

On the 26th of July, in company with Representatives Hewitt and Belmont, Mr. Dingley appeared before the committee on commerce to urge the adoption of his joint resolution. Captain James Parker, secretary of the American ship-owners' association, also addressed the committee. The resolution was reported to the house and referred to the committee of the whole. On the 5th day of August Mr. Dingley asked that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the resolution. Mr. Holman wanted to know "what good result we can hope for from this joint committee." Mr. Dingley replied that "the joint resolution is reported unanimously by the committee on commerce, and it seems to them to be the only feasible method of reaching certain information and formulating some plan for reviving the American merchant marine engaged in the foreign carrying trade. It should be borne in mind that within two years there have been great changes in the condition of American commerce. New facts have been developed, a new situation is presented, and this house and the American congress ought not to longer delay to take steps which will tend to the important result of restoring our flag to the commerce of the ocean." Mr. Dingley was supported by Mr. Cox of New York. The joint resolution was agreed to, and the speaker appointed Messrs. Page of California, Candler of Massachusetts, Robeson of New Jersey, Dingley of Maine, McLane of Maryland and Cox of New York members of this joint committee on the part of the house. Senators Miller of New York, Conger of Michigan and Vest of Missouri were appointed members on the part of the senate. The object of this commission was to inquire into the cause of the decline of American shipping, with a view to the enactment of laws during the next session enabling the American merchant marine to compete with that of foreign countries.

Mr. Dingley sustained President Arthur's veto of the river and harbor bill on the first day of August, and said: "I regard it as a wise and brave act. It calls for a halt in a system of so-called public improvements so dovetailed together that the success of one appropriation, however important, depends upon the success of others in no wise defensible."

At three o'clock on the afternoon of August 8th the first session of the forty-seventh congress came to an end. Mr. Dingley, weary from his long and arduous labors, left for Maine the day before congress adjourned; and on the 8th of the month once more joined his family circle at his summer home.

The campaign in Maine was already on when Mr. Dingley reached his home. The Republican speakers from out of the state were Messrs. Allison of Iowa, Plumb of Kansas, Rollins of New Hampshire, Miller of New York, Lynch of Virginia, Hawley of Connecticut, Kasson of Iowa, Hiscock of New York, Butterworth of Ohio, Windom of Minnesota, Keifer of Ohio, Foster of Ohio, Frederick Douglass, and General Green B. Raum, commissioner of internal revenue. Mr. Dingley at once plunged into the campaign. He spoke nearly every night until the day of election. The state election on September 11, was a great Republican victory, Frederick Robie, the Republican candidate for governor, receiving 72,481 votes. Harris M. Plaisted, the Democratic candidate for governor, received 63,921 votes, and Solon Chase, Greenbacker, 1,324 votes. Four Republican members of congress (at large)—Reed, Dingley, Boutelle and Milliken—were elected. The day following the election was one of great rejoicing. Cannon were fired in Lewiston and Mr. Dingley was serenaded by enthusiastic admirers. October 1st he made a temperance address in Tremont temple, Boston, and also addressed the Cambridge temperance reformers.

The significant features of the November election were the defeat of Judge Folger, the Republican candidate for governor of New York, and the election of a majority of Democrats to the lower house of congress. Both disasters were the result of the dictation of the Arthur administration and the stalwarts in national politics. It was a public rebuke pointing the way to Blaine's nomination at Chicago in 1884. But his nomination afforded an opportunity for stalwart revenge, and the great Republican leader met with defeat almost on the threshold of the White House.

November 14, Mr. Dingley went to New York to attend a meeting of the congressional shipping commission appointed in the closing hours of the preceding session. The commission met at the Fifth avenue hotel the next day and perfected an organization. Captain C. C. Duncan, United States shipping commissioner for the port of New York read the principal paper and offered recommendations for the restoration of discriminating duties and permitting the free importation of material of all kinds used in ship

construction, liberal postage compensation to fast American steamers bound to foreign ports, etc. John Roach read a statement saying that he had just taken a contract to build an iron ship at sixty-five dollars a ton, which could be built on the Clyde for more than five per cent less. He asked for the adoption of a fixed policy towards the shipping interest and presented documents showing the policy of foreign governments. During the course of the hearing Mr. Cox and John Roach became personal in their argument, and Mr. Dingley protested, saying that he thought the personality should go no further. Mr. Dingley took an active part in the hearings and at the close was appointed a member of a sub-committee (Messrs. Conger and Cox being the other two), to draft a bill and draw up a preliminary report. Mr. Dingley, as was his custom in all such matters, threw himself heartily into the work and performed all the labor. The bill was framed in his own handwriting. On the following day he devoted himself to the preparation of the report, all of which was personally prepared and written by him. Late in the month the committee adjourned to meet again in Washington. Mr. Dingley reached home in time to join his family around the Thanksgiving table. With a devout simplicity, sprung from Puritan ancestry, he gave thanks to "Him who had surrounded them with bountiful blessings," and into whose presence his sainted mother and beloved son had gone.

On the first day of December he returned to Washington, meeting with the shipping commission on the following day. The bill ¹ for the relief of American shipping, and the accompanying report, was largely the work of Mr. Dingley. December 15, they were presented to the house and referred to the committee on commerce. ² The report ³ contained a large amount of valuable information, and the bill was the first attempt since the civil war, to legislate for the revival of American shipping.

In addition to American shipping, internal revenue and the tariff were the questions before the second session of the forty-seventh congress. The tariff commission worked day and night to complete its report; and on the first day of the session, presented it

1—H. R. 7061, amending section 4081 of the revised statutes, a bill to remove certain burdens on the American shipping marine, to encourage the American foreign carrying trade, and to amend the laws relating to the shipment and discharge of seamen.

2—A deadlock between the free-traders and protectionists on the committee seemed to be inevitable, but Mr. Dingley proposed a compromise, which received the approval of every member of the committee.

3—A bound volume of speeches and reports in the possession of Mr. Dingley's family, contained a copy of this report, on which is made this memorandum in Mr. Dingley's handwriting: "Written by Mr. Dingley."

to the house. The commission declared "that high duties have a tendency to create prejudice and encourage unsafe investments of capital, and to cause a plethora of certain commodities; that the time has come when a reduction from high war rates can safely be made, and that the increase of production by the older industries is sufficient to admit of a reduction without impairment of ability to compete. The reduction on the average, and as a whole, approximate twenty per cent and will perhaps reach twenty-five per cent."


The great social event in official circles in Washington during the holidays, is the president's New Year's reception at the White House. Mr. Dingley, in company with one of his sons, attended this function on January 1, 1883. It was, as usual, a brilliant affair. There were sounds of many voices mingled with the strains of inspiring music. The members of the foreign diplomatic corps, and the officers of the army and navy were present, gorgeous in their official array. Among the distinguished guests was a modest unassuming man—Hon. Elisha A. Allen, Minister from the Hawaiian Islands to the United States. Mr. Allen and Mr. Dingley were personal friends, both being natives of Maine; and meeting in the cloak room they exchanged greetings. They had scarcely parted when Mr. Allen was seen to stagger and raise his hand to his heart. Friends assisted him to a couch near by where he immediately expired. Mr. Dingley was almost the last person Mr. Allen spoke to; and the incident shocked Mr. Dingley not a little. It was shortly after noon; and as soon as President Arthur learned of the affair, he immediately said: "This is sad indeed. The reception must stop at once." The president hurried to the cloak room and the remains of Mr. Allen were taken to the Hamilton house, where the funeral was held January 2.¹

Debate on the shipping bill began January 6th. Mr. Page of California, chairman of the committee, explained briefly the provisions of the bill, then surrendered the floor to Mr. Cox of New York and Mr. Dingley of Maine, the former against the bill and in favor of free ships; the latter for the bill and against free ships. In the course of his speech Mr. Cox said: "I do not greatly rely upon any method proposed by the majority for the revival of our ship building and ship using, although I must commend the conspicuous energy and the intelligence of the gentleman from Maine."

1—Mr. Allen was dean of the diplomatic corps. He moved to Maine in 1826, forming a partnership with Mr. Appleton, chief justice of the state. He was in the state legislature, and speaker of the house in 1833. In 1840 he was elected to congress. He was appointed consul to Hawaii in 1850. In 1857 he was appointed chief justice and chancellor of the kingdom.

With eloquent language and choice diction Mr. Cox closed one of the most remarkable and interesting speeches ever delivered in the house. But it was as weak in argument as it was strong in hyperbole and climax. Mr. Dingley followed; and before he had fairly got into his subject, the members drew nearer to catch every word he uttered. Carefully, logically and convincingly, he tore the mask from the speech of Mr. Cox and laid bare its sophistry and confusion. He reviewed the history of legislation in this and other countries; called attention to the decline of American shipping in the foreign trade; suggested proper remedies; pointed out the amendments proposed to the existing law; and denounced the free admission of ships built abroad. The complete knowledge and wide information displayed by Mr. Dingley astonished the house; and when at the end of two hours he apologized for taking so much time, there were cries of "Go on! go on!" from both sides of the house. He continued for half an hour, closing with an appeal to the house to try something—to take a step forward in this matter, "for if we go on ten years more in the way we have been going on for twenty-five years, the American merchant marine and the American flag will have faded from the ocean." This truly great speech was greeted with long-continued applause. It was a speech of a master—a statesman; and the house knew it. It placed Mr. Dingley in the front rank of congressmen, and gave him a national reputation. Of it the Washington Post said: "The speech delivered by Congressman Dingley of Maine on American shipping, was one of the most instructive addresses that the house has listened to during the present session. Mr. Dingley has studied his subject thoroughly, and being an experienced journalist, he knew how to put a great many facts into small space." The Washington correspondent of the Boston Journal said: "It is not often that a member receives the compliment of so close attention for so long a time on a subject which possesses so few popular attractions." A Washington despatch to the New York Tribune said: "Mr. Dingley is one of the best informed men in congress on matters relating to the shipping interest; and, although he spoke without notes, and was frequently interrupted, his argument was compact and lucid, and his imposing array of facts and statistics was so marshalled as to command an attentive audience throughout, although he spoke for more than two hours."

The shipping bill passed the house January 12, and Mr. Dingley thus achieved a great triumph. The measure removed existing burdens upon the running of American ships, and placed American



R. B. HAYES. W. W. PHELPS.
W. S. HOLMAN. JOHN A. KASSON.

merchantsmen on an equality with British ships. Of the bill Mr. Dingley said in an interview: "It is of more importance than appears at first glance. It addresses itself entirely to the running of American vessels in competition with their English rivals. The main cause of the decline in our merchant marine engaged in foreign trade for the past twenty years has been the inability of our vessels to compete in running with English vessels. Ship owners attribute this to our laws relating to merchant marine; to the burdens heaped upon them by these laws. The bill passed by the house removes these burdens. Mr. Hitt of Illinois, who in his connection with the state department, and as diplomatic agent abroad, is well acquainted with this subject, said to me that there has been no bill connected with our commercial marine passed for fifty years that has the importance of this bill."

The free-ship amendment happily was defeated by an overwhelming vote. Its adoption would have been a fatal blow to our shipping interests.

"That speech must have cost you a great amount of work," a friend said to Mr. Dingley.

"I had thought it all over and arranged it in my mind," he replied, "but I had not written it, and it is printed in the Congressional Record just as the stenographer took it down with the exception of a few inserts of paragraphs from authors to which I referred, but which I did not read. I have not set myself down to study the subject for any certain number of days. I have made it my knitting work for the past twelve months. Up to the time when I was elected to congress, a year ago, I had given no attention to the subject, and knew of it only as an editor knows of any matter of national interest. But I was elected to represent a ship-building district, and have studied its interests. I think I have read all that has been written on the subject of our shipping." Mr. Dingley received congratulations with characteristic modesty. Many senators whom he had never met sent him congratulatory notes. Senator Dawes of Massachusetts pronounced the speech the most able, exhaustive and intelligent presentation which the subject ever had.

The tariff question was absorbing the attention of the senate and the shipping bill was not reported out of the committee on commerce until ten days before the session closed, and then with an amendment. A senate caucus on the night of February 10th, called to determine "which of the various measures now pending in the senate shall be regarded as the most important to press to a vote," decided that the shipping bill seemed to present the greater claims

for precedence. The bill, however, was not taken up by the senate until the last night of the session, and even then, in order to get it up an agreement was necessary to strike out the tonnage tax section, which was violently opposed by the foreign steamship interests. It was passed by the senate after midnight of March 3rd and went back to the house. When it reached the house, that body was in a deadlock over a South Carolina election case. The committee in charge of that case waived it in order to allow Mr. Dingley to call up the shipping bill. Two attempts were made by Mr. Dingley to bring the bill before the house, but both failed. Thus the whole subject was thrown over to the next congress.

On the 18th of January Mr. Dingley addressed the national board of trade, and on the night of February 6th attended a Dartmouth college reunion at Willard's hotel, responding to the toast, "No Victory Without Toil"—a theme with which he was familiar. February 17 he addressed the association of American economists at Willard's hotel on "American Shipping."

Debate on the tariff bill reported from the committee on ways and means, began January 25th and continued for several weeks, but it was not until the 14th of February that Mr. Dingley took any part in this discussion. When the lumber schedule was reached, an amendment was offered to put manufactured lumber on the free list. Mr. Dingley opposed this amendment on the ground that "the manufacture of lumber in this country is the largest industry and the most diversified of any in the United States." Then turning to Mr. Holman, one of the leaders on the Democratic side he said: "It has been urged by the gentleman from Indiana that it is necessary to take away the protection of the lumber manufactured in Maine in order to protect our forests. This is a benevolent argument. It is the argument that comes from gentlemen representing those states which have no forests of their own to protect. It is the patriotism of Artemus Ward, who loved his country so much that he was willing to sacrifice all his wife's relations in her defence." He then called attention to another important consideration by saying: "Canada desires the markets of this country for her lumber. She is willing to give this country valuable privileges in return for the privilege of securing our markets for her lumber. She is willing by reciprocity treaty to give us the right to export to Canada a large number of our own products free of duty. The proposition presented by the free-lumber amendment, is to give Canada our markets for lumber with nothing in return. Whenever we shall adopt the policy of putting lumber on the free list it should

be done not on a tariff bill, but by a reciprocity treaty under which we can obtain from Canada value in return for that which we are to give."

After a long debate and a weary controversy between the senate and the house, the tariff bill of 1883 was sent to a conference and finally passed in the face of every obstacle which the Democratic members could suggest.

The conference report was agreed to in the senate by a majority of one, Mr. Ingalls casting the deciding vote in the affirmative. On the afternoon of March 3rd, the conference report was agreed to in the house by a majority of thirty-six. The debate was sharp and personal, the Democratic leaders making strenuous efforts to defeat the adoption of the report. The result was greeted with prolonged applause.

At noon on the 3rd of March the forty-seventh congress expired. Of Mr. Dingley's work, the Washington Post said: "Mr. Dingley of Maine will be in the next congress, backed by a larger majority than any other members of his state; and his zeal for the revival of American shipping will not be overlooked by the majority. His shipping bill will be revived and put through."

On the 7th of March Mr. Dingley and his devoted wife left Washington for a trip through the south. They visited several points, returning to Washington April 2nd. Three days later he was at his home in Maine among friends and neighbors.

That spring Mr. Dingley purchased a new home in Lewiston. Here in a modest way he lived for sixteen years. Surrounded by the members of his family, and his books and papers, he found the comfort, enjoyment and contentment of a happy christian home.

From the first of June until the first of December, Mr. Dingley gave much of his time to public addresses, principally on temperance. He spoke at Farmington, at the Congregational conference on the duty of the churches in temperance reform. At Lake Maranocook (near Lewiston) he made an address on "The Constitutional Amendment and Prohibition."¹ He also spoke at Weirs, New Hampshire camp grounds, at Nobleboro camp grounds, at North Anson, at Old Orchard, at Unity and at Gardiner. Early in October he made a flying trip to Washington where he called on President Arthur and Secretary Folger. He found time to do a large amount of editorial work during this period, to make a tour

1—See Appendix.

of his congressional district and to attend Republican conferences. On the last day of November he started for Washington to resume his labors in the halls of congress.

CHAPTER XIV.

1883-1885.


The forty-eighth congress assembled a year and a month after the Democratic party had elected a majority of the members of the lower house. There were in that body 196 Democrats, 118 Republicans, 5 Readjusters, 3 Independents and 3 Greenback-labor men. John G. Carlisle of Kentucky was nominated by the Democrats as speaker of the house. His rivals were Samuel Randall and S. S. Cox. The selection of Mr. Carlisle gave shape to the Democratic campaign of 1884, not only in the matter of the ticket but also of the platform. It meant that the tariff question was no longer a "local issue," but a national matter. A decided and square-cut issue between free-trade and protection was precipitated upon the country. Furthermore the organization of this house marked a return of the Democratic party to complete southern control. J. Warren Keifer of Ohio was renominated for speaker by the Republicans. The president's message was received with marked favor; and Mr. Dingley was especially pleased with that portion endorsing the recommendation of Secretary Folger, that the shipping bill, which failed of a passage in the preceding session, be re-introduced and passed.

In this house were Hilary A. Herbert of Alabama, secretary of the navy under President Cleveland; William S. Rosecrans of California, a distinguished southern soldier; Charles F. Crisp of Georgia, later speaker of the national house; Robert H. Hitt of Illinois, noted in diplomatic circles; Thomas J. Henderson of Illinois, a brave union soldier; William M. Springer of Illinois, subsequently chairman of the ways and means committee; Joseph G.

Cannon of Illinois, a veteran in congressional service; William R. Morrison, later chairman of the ways and means committee; William S. Holman and George W. Steele of Indiana, the latter associated with Mr. Dingley in 1897 with the preparation of the tariff bill; David B. Henderson and William P. Hepburn, veteran congressmen from Iowa; John G. Carlisle and J. C. S. Blackburn of Kentucky; Thomas B. Reed of Maine, the intellectual giant; John D. Long of Massachusetts, subsequently secretary of the navy; George D. Robinson of Massachusetts, afterwards governor of the Bay state; Richard P. Bland of Missouri of "silver dollar" fame; William Walter Phelps of Massachusetts, later ambassador to Germany; Henry W. Slocum of New York, a distinguished union soldier; Samuel S. Cox, Abram S. Hewitt, Frank Hiscock and Sereno E. Payne, also of New York; J. Warren Keifer, Frank H. Hurd, A. J. Warner, Joseph D. Taylor, William McKinley Jr., and Ezra B. Taylor, all distinguished members from Ohio; Samuel J. Randall, Henry J. Bingham, William D. Kelley, Andrew G. Curtin, all from Pennsylvania; Benton McMillin of Tennessee; John H. Reagan, David B. Culberson, Thomas P. Ochiltree and Roger Q. Mills, well known members from Texas; and William L. Wilson of West Virginia, subsequently chairman of the committee on ways and means that prepared the Wilson tariff bill.

Mr. Dingley immediately introduced to the house four important bills relating to shipping, the first to encourage American ship building in the foreign carrying trade; the second providing for licensing masters of vessels and others as pilots for sailing vessels in the coastwise trade; the third to remove certain burdens on the American merchant marine; the fourth to establish a bureau of commerce and navigation in the treasury department.

The Democratic party in the house was divided into two warring factions—the Carlisle or free trade wing and the Randall or protection wing. The struggle between the factions over the selection of committees was fierce, and the result was a distinct triumph of the Carlisle wing. Indeed this faction served notice on Mr. Randall and the protection Democracy that "Democracy is not incidental protection but tariff for revenue only and free trade." The old free trade policy under which the country suffered was re-inaugurated. The announcement of the committees gave shape to the political issues of the next campaign. Important things were foreshadowed—Ohio was abandoned to the Republicans and the pledges of the Ohio Democrats were forsworn. The manufacturing interests were informed that they must "go it alone." The New



J. G. CARLISLE. CHAS. H. CRISP.
JOSEPH McKENNA. BENJ. BUTTERWORTH.

York Democrats were left in division. There was no hope of stopping the silver coinage. "Tariff reform" was to be the issue.

In the matter of committee assignments, Mr. Dingley fared well. He was placed at the head of the Republicans on the committee on banking and currency and the new committee on American shipping.

Speaker Carlisle was worked into a state of physical collapse by the perplexities over the making up of these committees; and there was a significant wink among the temperance advocates in the house, when the committee on alcoholic liquor traffic came to the surface with not a temperance man on it! And all but one voted against having any such committee! The committee on the revival of American shipping was pronounced a strong one, while much diversity of opinion existed among the members of the committee on banking and currency. Mr. Dingley expressed the opinion that "a majority of the committee is disposed to treat the banks with fairness."

On the 9th of January Chairman Slocum of the special shipping committee reported the new Dingley shipping bill to the house. The report accompanying the bill (written by Mr. Dingley) was substantially the report accompanying the bill which passed the house the previous session. The committee voted unanimously to report this measure thus showing their confidence in Mr. Dingley. The shipping interests waited anxiously for congress to act; but the appropriation bills and the bill for the relief of Fitz John Porter occupied several weeks of the session of the house. In the meantime the house shipping committee authorized Mr. Dingley to favorably report the bill to constitute a bureau of navigation in the treasury department. Mr. Dingley's shipping bill was also adopted by the senate committee and Senator Frye was authorized to report it favorably. But the session of the house dragged, enlivened in February, however, by Chairman Morrison's famous "horizontal" tariff reform bill. After two months' labor, Mr. Morrison, chairman of the ways and means committee, made public his scheme, which consisted mainly of a twenty per cent horizontal reduction of the tariff rates, without regard to the condition of each industry which it was to effect, with a provision that "no duty shall be less than that provided by the act of 1861." This was the first attempt of the "reformers" to put their tariff talk into figures, after a discussion of twenty-seven years. It gave the country some idea of what the reformers would do if they had the power. Mr. Randall

and the protection Democrats denounced the measure. "Horizontal reform" caused astonishment and disappointment.

It was in this congress that the first attempt was made by the Republicans to have the house rules amended so as to permit a majority to proceed with business. Notwithstanding the fact that the Democrats were in the majority, they rejected the Reed amendment, thus practically voting a want of confidence in themselves. Under the existing rules, all bills went to one of three calendars, and had to be considered in the order reported, unless they were appropriation, revenue or election matters which were privileged. Nothing short of a two-thirds vote on suspension day, could take a bill out of its order. But the opposition of the Democrats insured inaction on important measures during this session.

While Mr. Dingley was patiently waiting for his shipping bill to be reached, he busied himself with careful investigations of the operations of the government, and with other matters which deeply interested him. He continued the studious habits he early acquired. His Washington home was littered with books and pamphlets on tariff, finance and temperance. His desk and table were covered with newspaper clippings and scraps of paper on which he had written notes and memoranda and figures. He was not a careful man in the appearance of his workshop or study. He would sit for hours, his head bent over his lap, his knees together and his feet pointing in until the toes of his shoes met, writing on a pad or a bundle of copy paper. He would start his speech or address, write from twenty to fifty pages, and perhaps not touch it again for weeks. He would write out conclusions and ideas he had gathered from his reading or from study. When engaged in the preparation of his great speech on the shipping bill and the report accompanying it, he was so absorbed in his topic that he scarcely knew of the presence of another person in the room. He was apparently unbusinesslike in his methods of preparing and handling his material. It appeared to be scattered from one end of the room to the other; but from the apparent confusion he knew where to obtain everything when needed. He made a mental note of every figure and every point; and with that rare skill which only a trained newspaper man possesses, he marshaled all his material as a general marshals his soldiers.

By way of diversion he delivered a lecture in Washington on temperance in which he gave a sketch of the result of prohibition in Maine. He said that "the law has come to stay, and does a great

deal of good. There is less crime in Maine according to population than in any state wholly under license."

Another week passed, and the house did nothing of moment. Mr. Dingley introduced a bill authorizing the secretary of the treasury to invest in four per cent bonds at his discretion, the lawful money now in the treasury to the credit of the national banks for the retirement of circulation. The amount of this fund was about thirty-six million dollars and was constantly on the increase. Mr. Dingley's bill was designed to prevent further contraction of the currency from this source.

The shipping committee agreed to report adversely the bill to admit foreign built ships to American registry, free of duty. The same committee referred the postal steamship bill to Messrs. Hunt and Dingley for investigation; and authorized Mr. Dingley to favorably report the pilotage bill permitting the masters and mates of American sailing vessels to be examined and licensed by United States inspectors to pilot their own vessels. The bill also provided that when any sailing vessel is in tow of a steamer which is in charge of a United States pilot, "such vessel shall not be compelled to employ a pilot."

A bill to extend not to exceed two years, the payment of the tax on distilled spirits in warehouses, caused much discussion in the house at this time. Mr. Morrison, chairman of the committee on ways and means said in his report that the passage of the bill "would probably prevent serious disaster and bankruptcy not only to the interest itself, but to associate business interests." Mr. Dingley opposed the bill. He said that "the proposition involved in this extension is practically to lend the holders of whiskey sixty-three million dollars, the amount of the tax on the whiskey which will accumulate in the next year or two, and to lend that immense sum of money at the rate of four and a half per cent per annum.

* * * I object to that proposition, first because it is not the business of this government to lend money to anyone; second, because by extending the period for paying the whiskey tax from three years now allowed by law to five years, we would eventually lose all or a large part of the sixty-three million dollar tax on whiskey now in bond." ¹ He contended that the existing law made no discrimination against the whiskey interest, and when the bonded period was extended to three years, congress had gone to the utmost limit. To pass the bill would favor whiskey as no other product was favored. The recommendation of the committee of

1—See Appendix.

the whole that the enacting clause of the bill be stricken out was agreed to by the house by a vote of 186 to 83.

The session of the house was rather uninteresting until the bill to retire the trade dollar was reached. The silver question was a tender topic with many, and the bill precipitated a long debate. The coinage of the trade dollar was authorized by the act of February 12, 1873. About thirty-six million dollars had been coined; and it was proposed to exchange trade dollars for standard silver dollars coined under the act of February 28, 1878. "Silver dollar" Bland of Missouri, made a notable speech in which he objected to that portion of the bill providing that the retirement of the trade dollars should be at the expense of the monthly purchase of bullion and the coinage of standard silver dollars as now provided by law. The discussion covered the whole question of silver coinage and the battle of the standards was foreshadowed. Before the discussion closed Mr. Dingley took a hand. He called attention to the fact that if the trade dollars were not to be treated as bullion after they were retired "then the proposition was to increase the coinage of standard silver dollars to the extent of the silver bullion that may be purchased in the form of trade dollars. A new question is forced upon the house, namely, will this house consent to the enlargement of the coinage of the standard silver dollars?" He said he objected to the coinage of more silver dollars "to be piled up in the treasury when nobody wants them." He favored the bill as it came from the committee because it would neither increase nor diminish the silver coinage. He closed his brief address by saying: "I for one believe in the use of both gold and silver in the full legal tender coinage of this country. But I say to you gentlemen, you never can successfully use both metals unless they are coined at a bullion value which shall be equivalent, and then and only then can you secure the full circulation of silver." Mr. Bland succeeded in carrying his point, 131 advocates of more silver dollars voting with him. Mr. Dingley voted against the Bland amendment, and joined with 44 others in voting against the bill. But 198 members supported the measure as amended, and the bill was passed.

Ever watchful of the interests of temperance, Mr. Dingley objected to the tabling of the bill to provide for a commission on the subject of alcoholic liquor traffic. He asked that the bill be placed upon the calendar of the committee of the whole and it was so ordered.

All efforts to consider Mr. Dingley's shipping bill had thus far failed. Private legislation and appropriation bills were used to an-

tagonize everything. Six thousand bills and three hundred joint resolutions had been introduced in the house, of which only two had become laws. Finally the Morrison tariff bill was brought up by a majority vote of two, and debate began. But it was a foregone conclusion that the bill would not pass.

The last of April, Mr. Dingley's bill creating a bureau of navigation in the treasury department passed the house by a large majority. In explaining the bill Mr. Dingley said that the measure if enacted into law "would establish in the treasury department a bureau similar in many respects to the British board of trade which has charge of the British merchant marine, with a head who shall be amply fitted by experience and by ability to direct affairs relating to our merchant marine." This bill later became a law, and the expectations of its friends were realized. This bureau has become one of the most important departments of the treasury department and has been presided over by able men.

The house continued to discuss the tariff bill, Mr. McKinley of Ohio making a notable speech on the 22nd of April. On the same day "Calamity" Weller of Iowa, objected to the consideration of Mr. Dingley's bill to allow the investment of moneys deposited in the treasury for the redemption of the circulation of national banks going out of business. The bill would have prevented the contraction of currency and saved the government the interest on so much money. Mr. Weller shouted: "Let the national banking system be wiped out." Nothing could be said or done to remove the objection of the member from Iowa and Mr. Dingley simply said: "Very well; I have done my duty."

Fortunately, Mr. Slocum of New York, chairman of the special shipping committee, represented a shipping district. His home was in Brooklyn, and his constituents were interested in ship building and commerce. He was a warm admirer of Mr. Dingley, and although a Democrat relied implicitly upon the integrity and accurate information of the member from the second Maine district. Mr. Slocum was heartily in favor of the bill and assisted materially in bringing many members of his own party to the support of the measure. Mr. Slocum was a distinguished civil war veteran and a fine looking man. His clear-cut features, long white hair and military bearing made him a noticeable member on the floor of the house. But behind the distinguished and courteous chairman was the pilot of the measure—Mr. Dingley. The bill itself was largely the product of Mr. Dingley's labors. The report accompanying the bill was submitted by the chairman, but was written by Mr. Ding-

ley.¹ The bill came up in the house April 26, and Chairman Slocum made a brief explanatory speech. Then the debate became general, in which Mr. Dingley took part. Amendments were offered by the opponents of the measure, and Mr. Dingley with rare skill and tact, accepted the unimportant and opposed what would materially injure the bill. It was no easy task to get such a measure through a Democratic house. The danger point was reached when Mr. Cox of New York moved a "free-ship" amendment, which in Mr. Dingley's opinion would defeat the whole bill. Although a separate measure covering the proposition of "free-ships" was before the house, Mr. Cox preferred to have the question tested at this point. Mr. Dingley then made an earnest argument against the free-ship amendment.¹ It was pronounced an able effort; but the free-trade majority adopted the amendment, and the bill passed with the free-ship clause attached. Although disappointed over the action of the house, Mr. Dingley felt confident that the senate would defeat the objectionable amendment. On the 9th of May the senate amended the house bill by striking out the free-ship clause and adding the senate provision granting a limited subsidy in the nature of foreign mail pay to American steamship lines. Senator Frye asked for a committee of conference which was agreed to, Messrs. Frye of Maine, Miller of New York and Vest of Missouri being the conferees. On the 28th of May the house agreed to a conference; Messrs. Slocum, Dibble and Dingley were appointed conferees. It was not until June 17 that the conferees met; and after a protracted meeting a deadlock resulted on the free-ship and subsidy clauses. At this conference Mr. Dingley and Mr. Frye, both from Maine and both from the same city, labored hard to secure the rejection of the "free-ship" amendment and the retention of the "mail pay" amendment, offered by the senate. The latter amendment simply authorized the post-master general to contract for the carrying of our foreign mails with American steamship companies, the contract to be given to the lowest bidder. Several heated conferences were held. There were three Republicans and three Democrats, with Mr. Slocum rather inclined to the views held by the Republicans on the "free-ship" amendment. Finally on the night of the 20th the conferees from both houses made concessions, and it was decided to report the bill without either the free-ship or mail pay amendments. On the following day, the conference report was agreed to by both

1—See Appendix.

houses. Thus, after two months of opposition on the part of the Democrats, the shipping bill substantially as drawn originally by Mr. Dingley, passed congress and June 26th received the signature of President Arthur. It became a law July 1st. Thus Mr. Dingley scored his first great triumph in congress. He received congratulations from the maritime association of New York,¹ the maritime exchange of Philadelphia, John Roach, and other American ship builders and owners.

As this was the first step that had been taken by congress for half a century to encourage American shipping, the measure attracted much attention, and gave Mr. Dingley a merited reputation as the leading friend of the American merchant marine in congress. Mr. Dingley said in reference to the measure that "the movement for the relief of American shipping is not fictitious or simply local, but answers to a long and deeply felt and quite general demand. We may now look for a more intelligent comprehension of the needs of the shipping interest and legislation required."

Nobody outside of Washington realized the amount of hard work performed by Mr. Dingley in putting through his shipping bill. But his efforts were appreciated even where their extent was not fully realized.

March 11th, Mr. Dingley made a lengthy report from the shipping committee on "pilotage," accompanying his bill to relieve American vessels of the obligations to pay state pilots not used.² The bill was not reached for action.

Debate on the Morrison tariff bill still dragged wearily. Innumerable speeches, most of them for the benefit of constituents, were delivered. Mr. Dingley followed the debate carefully, notwithstanding the fact that he was deeply absorbed in the shipping bill. He had in years past, devoted much time to a study of the tariff question, and his mind was already stored with a vast amount of information and fundamental knowledge. In early manhood and throughout his college course, he had made a specialty of political economy. He refused to accept the dogmas of the free-trade text books, and entered public life as a confirmed protectionist. This

1—Mr. Dingley received the following from the maritime association of the port of New York: "Now that success has happily crowned your efforts on behalf of the commerce of the country in the final passage of your shipping bill, the gratitude of all commercial communities throughout the United States is due to you and to those who aided you in its progress and passage. Leaving untouched the disputed questions of free ships and subsidies, the measure as adopted embraces those points which divergent interests agree upon as essential to the successful competition with the world upon the common ocean. For your indefatigable perseverance, affecting so valuable and comprehensive a result, please accept our sincerest thanks and most cordial congratulations."

2—See Appendix.

debate in the house afforded him the opportunity he had been waiting for; and when on the 29th of April, Mr. Turner of Kentucky closed a long speech in favor of the Morrison bill and the principle of a low tariff, Mr. Dingley took the floor. The house had already learned to listen while this member from Maine spoke. The members knew he had something to say, not to his constituents alone, but to the whole country. He talked not to the galleries but to an intelligent nation. The Democrats having the bill in charge, watched the speaker closely to detect weak points in his argument, if any should appear. In this exhaustive speech,¹ Mr. Dingley answered what he characterized the fallacies of the free trade idea, and carefully discussed the bearings of the tariff question upon the price of labor and merchandise. He said that "the issue raised by this bill is whether our tariff legislation in the future shall be adjusted with a view not only of revenue, but also of protecting home industries against the unequal competition of foreign industries employing cheaper labor, or whether it shall be adjusted so as to exclude protection solely with the view of revenue." This was the keynote of the whole debate. In answer to the charge that protection is a system of robbery, he said that "protection is not intended to benefit capital, except so far as capital is benefited by general prosperity." He made a strong point when he declared that "the average purchasing power of wages in the United States is forty per cent greater than in England." In reply to the "free raw material" argument, put forward by the advocates of the bill, Mr. Dingley said that "the raw material of one industry is the manufactured product of some other industry, and there is no such thing as raw material upon which human labor has been expended." He maintained that "a protective duty is not a tax," and that "home production cheapens prices." In pointing out the blessings of protection to farmers, he said that "it is essential to the success of farming in the United States that the pursuits of our people should be diversified. And it will be found that, other things being equal, farmers are most prosperous in those states where manufacturing industries are established, and pursuits of the people diversified, and home markets created." Mr. Dingley was warmly congratulated by the Republican members of the house who were deeply impressed by the sound logic and the accurate information. The Democratic leaders, also impressed by the ability displayed, joined in the congratulations. Mr. Dingley received these commendations with characteristic modesty; and when the house adjourned

1—See Appendix.

quietly retired to his apartments. But this speech was the first step toward the high position he attained as a tariff authority. It was regarded as so satisfactory an exposition of the tariff from the protection standpoint that extracts from it were published and circulated as campaign documents.

It was a curious coincidence that Mr. Dingley was renominated by the second district congressional convention in Auburn on the same day that he delivered this tariff speech. General James A. Hall of Damariscotta presided. Joseph S. Hoyt of Franklin county arose and said: "Mr. Chairman, everyone seems to be somewhat modest today. I will present the name of a candidate for representative to congress, a gentleman whose valuable service fully commends itself. I move that Hon. Nelson Dingley Jr., be nominated by acclamation by the convention as representative to the forty-ninth congress from the second congressional district." The entire convention acquiesced and in the midst of applause the nomination was made unanimous. The resolutions declared that "we heartily commend to the electors of the second congressional district the nominee of this convention, Hon. Nelson Dingley Jr., as a Republican, devoted to Republican principles, equal rights, equal privileges, a free ballot, a fair count, protection to American industry, temperance, free schools, encouragement of American shipping, the promotion of the efficacy and purity of the civil service, and a sound currency, and whose official course has shown him to be a faithful representative of his constituents."

A week later, May 6, the Morrison tariff bill was given its death blow in the house. Mr. Morrison in closing the debate, turned to Mr. Randall and said excitedly: "You claim to have the power to strike out the enacting clause of this bill. If you have that power, you have the power to amend this bill and make it what it should be." This remark was greeted with tremendous applause on the Democratic side. The debate over, a murmur of expectancy ran through the ranks of both opponents and advocates of the measure, as the chairman directed the clerk to read the bill. The audience which throughout the day crowded the galleries almost to suffocation, hushed their hum of conversation and watched with intense interest further proceedings on the floor. Mr. Converse of Ohio, pushed his way to the front, and moved to strike out the enacting clause. This was the signal for a volley of hisses and groans from the Democratic side, and this demonstration was met by rounds of applause from the Republican side. The scene in the chamber was of intense excitement and confusion to which the gal-

eries rendered no little aid by loud tokens of approval and disapproval. The tellers being ordered, Messrs. Converse and Morrison were appointed by the chair. Before taking his place Mr. Morrison called to the clerk of the house, who was standing by the speaker's desk, and exclaimed: "Clerk, see that no d—d scoundrel who is paired goes between the tellers." The first man to pass through in the negative was Reagan of Texas, who had been brought in on an invalid's chair in order to cast his vote, and he was heartily applauded by friends of the negative vote. The announcement that the "ayes have it," was greeted with cheers from the Republican side; and the cheers were taken up by the galleries and reverberated from every nook and corner of the hall. Ladies stood up and waved their handkerchiefs, and the men waved their hats. When the last name on the list had been called in the house, Speaker Carlisle said to the clerk: "Call my name." His name was called and the speaker voted "No," amid another round of cheers. The final announcement of the defeat of the bill by a vote of 159 to 155, was cheered enthusiastically. Republicans and protection Democrats rose in their seats and gave cheer after cheer. Some waved papers above their heads, while others added to the confusion by continuous clapping of hands. Thus died the Morrison tariff bill and "tariff reform."

Thus the Democratic party was badly divided on the eve of a presidential election. It organized the national house, resolved to leave its position as a mere fault-finder, as an organized negation, and start out with one definite principle, and it was this: that the protective tariff must be overthrown and a free-trade or revenue tariff, substituted. A speaker was chosen after a bitter fight, pledged to appoint a committee on ways and means favorable to such a bill. After an incubation of nearly three months this committee reported the Morrison tariff bill, changed so that its authors hardly knew it. The Republicans almost solidly objected to a bill whose purpose it was to inaugurate the abolition of all protective duties. Every Republican but two from Minnesota, and forty protection Democrats voted to strike out the enacting clause. The Democracy of Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, Ohio and California, declared they would have nothing of the kind. The bitterness exhibited between the two wings of the party was very great.

The Republican national convention was scheduled for June 3rd at Chicago. Sentiment seemed to drift strongly towards James G. Blaine, and the friends of the Maine leader already counted 361

votes to his credit, 411 being necessary to a choice. But Mr. Blaine himself thus far, was as silent as a sphynx. He said that "he had not so much as lifted a little finger to secure a single delegate." And yet, whenever Mr. Blaine went out to ride in Washington, he was shadowed by reporters, and recreation twisted into a dark and unfathomable conspiracy to capture the presidency. If he called on a friend, he was said to be hatching some sly plot to carry off the nomination.

The singular spontaniety of the movement in Mr. Blaine's behalf made it the grandest tribute paid an American statesman since the days of Washington. The stalwarts' strength was divided between Arthur and Edmunds; but for the first time there was comparative good feeling. Senators Frye and Hale of Maine, who had been reported as unfriendly to Mr. Blaine, stated emphatically that Mr. Blaine would receive the united support of Maine. A few days before the convention Mr. Blaine went to his home in Augusta, where he remained until after the convention. Before leaving Washington he told his immediate friends that he did not want to be in Washington, if nominated, and within sight and hearing of President Arthur. He did not want anything done that would injure President Arthur's feelings.

On the last day of May, Mr. Dingley, in company with Representatives Milliken and Boutelle of Maine and Representative Long of Massachusetts, left Washington for Chicago to attend the national Republican convention. The headquarters of the party was the Grand Pacific hotel. Already the city was thronged with delegates and visitors. Two hundred members of the Maine Blaine club made their presence known in a boisterous manner. In a quiet but effective way, Mr. Dingley advanced the cause of his life-long friend. Monday evening, June 2nd, the Maine delegation paid a visit of respect to the Iowa delegation at the Sherman house. The California delegation was also present, and enthusiastic speeches for Mr. Blaine were made by Mr. Dingley and Mr. Boutelle of Maine, and General Stone of Iowa. The convention met June 3rd in the Exposition building. Fourteen thousand people were present. Mr. Dingley and party occupied prominent seats on the stage. It was a sight long to be remembered. Roman standards, pendants with blue silk banners imprinted with gold, in mottoes of states and territories, rose from the edges of the aisles. A sea of faces swayed in the midst of fluttering flags and banners. Bands played patriotic airs. It was, as George William Curtis said, "the supreme council of the Republican party." It was Mr. Blaine against the field; and

when John R. Lynch, a colored delegate from Mississippi was elected temporary chairman, a scene of great excitement followed. It was apparently a victory of the opponents of Mr. Blaine, but Mr. Dingley did not regard it as "strictly drawing a line as to the relative strength of Blaine to that of the field-candidates against him. It was not an indication of presidential preferences."

The name of Mr. Blaine threw the convention into a whirlwind of excitement. He was the popular idol; and when the blind orator, Judge West of Ohio, was conducted to the platform there was a hush throughout the vast hall. In a speech of remarkable strength and candor, Judge West placed Mr. Blaine in nomination. The balloting began Friday morning, the fourth day of the convention; and on the fourth ballot Mr. Blaine was nominated. He received 334 1-2 votes on the first ballot, 349 on the second, 375 on the third and 544 on the fourth. The result of the fourth ballot was received with great enthusiasm, the band playing and cannon booming outside the hall. The nomination was made at half past four in the afternoon, and even before the last figures were pronounced, the vast audience arose and broke into another mad demonstration of enthusiasm. Cheers resounded; the band played inspiring airs, and hats and handkerchiefs and national flags were waved. A large square banner from Kansas was carried through the hall, promising immense majorities in that state for Blaine. The roar of the artillery outside was heard commingling with the louder roar of the voices from within, and amid great enthusiasm the nomination was made unanimous. That evening General John A. Logan of Illinois was nominated for vice president. Thus the two wings of the Republican party, after years of fighting, were again reunited on the eve of what appeared to be a most auspicious national campaign.

Mr. Dingley in a public interview said: "The talk of disaffection will not affect the ticket one particle in the end, unless it is to increase the aggregate vote for Blaine. I believe that where one Independent leaves the party, a half dozen Democrats will support Blaine and Logan. These papers have been preaching free trade, and have been generally antagonistic to the Republican party, and it is fortunate that they have gone over where they belong—to the Democracy." On the night of June 6th Mr. Dingley left Chicago for Washington, rejoiced over the success of Maine's favorite son. On the 19th he addressed a Blaine ratification meeting in Washington. The presidential campaign was fairly launched, and the first session of the 48th congress was drawing to a close. Tilden's

letter of withdrawal concentrated the Democrats upon Grover Cleveland of New York. Benjamin Butler, who had already received the presidential nomination of the Greenback party, was coquetting with the Democracy; but on the 11th of July the Democratic national convention, after a stormy session of four days, nominated Cleveland and Hendricks for president and vice president. The platform adopted denounced the Republican party "for having failed to relieve the people from crushing war taxes," and pledged the Democratic party "to raise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests; but in making reductions in taxes it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries but rather to promote their healthy growth." On the money question the party said, "we believe in honest money—the gold and silver coinage of the constitution—and a circulating medium convertible into such money without loss." Benjamin Butler, who was a delegate to the convention made a minority report from this committee on resolutions, and created much laughter and amusement by saying: "And now read that platform—read that tariff plank—and then see if you can find out exactly what it does mean? It does not mean protection. If it did Col. Morrison is too honest a man to bring it here. And yet it is twisted so that it is supposed that it might mean protection." On account of the opposition of the south to Butler, his name had been withdrawn, but he remained a thorn in the Democratic side. Mr. Cleveland was nominated on the second ballot in the midst of a whirlwind of excitement. •

Congress adjourned the day before the Democratic convention assembled in Chicago. Two days before adjournment, Mr. Dingley's bill to establish a bureau of navigation in the treasury department, became a law. The act provided for a commissioner of navigation, charged with the supervision of the interests of the merchant marine of the United States. Jarvis Patten of Bath, Maine, was appointed the first commissioner under the act.

Mr. Dingley commented thus on the session which had come to a close: "The house of representatives has shown itself a most incapable body. It has not been able to take up and despatch the public business, and has left much of it undone from sheer lack of capacity. It has shown extreme perversity, in its refusal to take up important matters that really demanded important attention, in its neglect of business, and its attempt to make political capital rather than to attend to the public business. In these respects it has gone to such extremes as to convince all thoughtful men that it is not safe to entrust the Democratic party with full control of the gov-

ernment or to continue it in power in the popular branch of congress. There is a long list of public questions whose consideration has been deferred, which have almost imperatively demanded the attention of congress, and the ignoring of which has been a fatal neglect of public business. While the Democrats were unable to unite their differing factions on the tariff question, they have clearly shown that the largest majority of their party, as represented in congress, is in favor of free trade, and have thus created an issue which will predominate, regardless of the action of their national convention. The people have been placed face to face with the tariff issue, and it must now be fought out." On the last day of the session Mr. Dingley started for his home in Maine, and once more rejoined his family at his summer abode. Here his mind and body obtained much needed rest. Surrounded by his loved ones, his kind, gentle and generous nature communed with God.

The nomination of Mr. Blaine for president made the Democratic case in Maine hopeless. Republican rallies were held in every county. Big mass meetings and state rallies were held in the principal cities. Mr. Blaine, at his home in Augusta, received daily, distinguished public men, journalists and prominent Republicans. Mr. Dingley paid Mr. Blaine a visit July 12th and congratulated him personally. The nominee greeted Mr. Dingley with unconcealed warmth, and expressed his profound gratitude. Mr. Blaine read to Mr. Dingley his letter of acceptance and asked the latter's opinion. Mr. Dingley pronounced it admirable and subsequently wrote that "it cannot but serve to sweep away the misrepresentations of Mr. Blaine's attitude on public questions, and to convince every candid man of his conservative, patriotic, statesmanlike and truly American principles."

The enemies of Mr. Blaine were busy. The spectre of Fisher and Mulligan again appeared and the Republican candidate was obliged to defend himself against his maligners. Perhaps it can never be proved to some men that Mr. Blaine was absolutely innocent of wrong-doing in this connection; but the fact remains that nothing wrong was ever proved. At all events, Mr. Dingley always stoutly declared that the charges against Mr. Blaine were false. While discussing these charges he wrote that "it may be well to remark that the character of Mr. Blaine has never been successfully impeached. In business and in social life his record is clean. He has never been accused of disloyalty to his home or want of public spirit. His personal habits are such as will bear close inspection. In private life a cleaner man cannot be found. Whether in the

work of educational, moral or religious reform, Mr. Blaine is never niggardly or a loiterer. As in Garfield's case, however, the attempt is made in Blaine's, to impeach a career of uniform honor, integrity and public spirit."

The Maine campaign continued vigorously. Mr. Dingley addressed political meetings at different points in the state during the last half of July, the entire month of August and the first week in September. July 17 in company with Senator Frye he made an address at the dedication of the Poland Springs Music hall. August 2nd he addressed a temperance gathering at Lake Sebago. He said that the adoption of the prohibitory amendment was important because it was regarded everywhere as a test vote on the question of prohibition or license. He addressed himself to the women in the audience and appealed to them to aid in its adoption by their influence at home and in the social circle, and by their presence at the polls in distributing affirmative ballots.

The big rally of the campaign was held at Lake Maranocook, a few miles from Lewiston, August 12th. Fifteen thousand people were present. The speaking was opened from three stands presided over by Senators Frye and Hale and Governor Connor. When Mr. Blaine arrived the enthusiasm of the fifteen thousand people was without limit. After some minutes the excitement began to die away into cheers, and then with hats and handkerchiefs waving it broke out again anew. Nothing approaching it was ever seen in Maine before. Mr. Dingley was one of the speakers at this memorable gathering.

Election day in Maine was September 8th. It was very warm and sultry; but the Republicans polled a larger vote than ever before. A novel feature at the polls was the presence of ladies distributing votes for the prohibitory constitutional amendment which carried by over 43,000 majority. Frederick Robie was re-elected governor by over 15,000 majority and the four Republican members of congress, Reed, Dingley, Milliken and Boutelle were re-elected by large majorities. Mr. Dingley said that the splendid majority for the Republicans was "a sufficient response to the false charges and persistent abuse which had been heaped upon Mr. Blaine." On the vote on the prohibitory amendment Mr. Dingley said that "the emphatic result will strengthen the cause in Maine and carry great encouragement to the friends of prohibition in other states."

In commenting on the significance of the victory Mr. Dingley wrote: "It is undoubtedly true that much of this Republican in-

crease is due to the belief of the people in the wisdom of the Republican protective policy. But more is due to the great personal popularity of Mr. Blaine in Maine, and to the unjust abuse heaped upon him by the Democratic speakers and organs. Unless something new comes up, it is well nigh certain that every northern state will give its electoral vote to Blaine."

Mr. Blaine's brilliant tour through the west began the latter part of September. It was a most remarkable exhibition of physical endurance and rare judgment. His addresses were models of political utterances, and his presence aroused the people to unusual enthusiasm.

From the close of the Maine campaign to the 22nd of October Mr. Dingley devoted his time to editorial work. His articles touching all public questions, were able and comprehensive. The Lewiston Journal was a power.

The October victory in Ohio and West Virginia gave the Republicans fresh hope. It appeared to settle the presidential contest. The tide was surely setting in favor of Blaine and the election of the Republican candidate was apparently as certain as any future event.

The Republican national committee early recognized Mr. Dingley's influence on the stump, not because of his eloquence, for he possessed little; but because of his wide and accurate information and his convincing way of presenting it. Late in October he started on a stumping tour through western Massachusetts and eastern New York. Under the date of October 27 he wrote to the Lewiston Journal an interesting letter giving his observations of the presidential campaign in Massachusetts and New York. "In response to your request," he wrote, "that I should give the Journal readers my impression of the presidential outlook in the two states which I have visited during the past week I may say in general that I find the situation even more cheering for the Republican cause than I supposed. I addressed large Republican meetings, with other speakers, at Beverly, Fall River, and Pittsfield, Mass., last week, and had an opportunity to confer with leading Republicans and members of the state committee. I find that the only question in the old Bay state is as to the size of Blaine's plurality—the figures standing all the way from 25,000 to 50,000. Blaine's vote will reach and probably exceed 150,000; Cleveland's vote will be from 100,000 to 120,000; and Butler's from 30,000 to 50,000. In order to reach my appointments in western New York, I was compelled to leave Pittsfield by the 11 o'clock night train

immediately after speaking there. Reaching Palmyra (twenty-five miles east of Rochester) at 11 o'clock Friday morning, I was taken by team to Fairport (twelve miles), where a large mass meeting of the Republicans of Monroe county was held in the afternoon, addressed by Cassius M. Clay, the veteran Kentucky abolitionist, and myself. Mr. Clay, although seventy-four years of age, is still vigorous and heartily Republican. In the evening there was a grand torch-light procession in which 1,600 torch-bearers participated. It was a grand display, and gave a striking idea of the Blaine enthusiasm in western New York.

"Saturday evening I addressed a large Republican meeting at Perry, Wyoming county; and this week speak in Schuyler, Oswego, St. Lawrence and Franklin counties, closing at Malone. I have conferred with leading Republicans and members of the state committee, and I find all entirely confident that Mr. Blaine will carry New York on Tuesday of next week—none placing the plurality at less than 25,000, and many insisting that it will reach from 50,000 to 75,000.

"Said a prominent member of the state committee to me this morning, 'The Republicans will have at least 100,000 plurality over Cleveland in New York state outside of New York city, Brooklyn, and Kings county. Cleveland's plurality in these three Democratic strongholds will not be much over 50,000. Butler's vote in the state is set at 50,000.'

"I never saw greater enthusiasm in a campaign than is witnessed here on the Republican side. Every night torch-light processions are in order, and the air rings with Blaine and Logan songs. Evidently the Democrats are discouraged although they are working with vigor. Here in Rochester it is estimated that 100,000 Irish-Americans and workingmen who have heretofore voted the Democratic ticket, will vote for Blaine and that the Republican majority in this county (Monroe) will be larger than Garfield's in 1880.


"I am informed that the only hope of the Democrats lies in the St. John movement, which they are doing their utmost to encourage, as they recognize the fact that a Republican vote for St. John is half a vote for Cleveland. It is well understood that the Democrats supply the money for the St. John campaign; and even the liquor interests, which have declared for the Democratic ticket, is expressing a hope that 'temperance men will vote as they pray' meaning by this that they shall vote for the independent prohibitory party, so as to aid in Cleveland's election.

"This is so plain that many temperance men who had intended to vote for St. John, will now vote for Blaine. The Democrats have hoped to get 50,000 votes in New York for St. John, which would mainly come from the Republican ranks; but it is now thought they will not get more than half this number. New York may be put down as sure for Blaine.

"It is well understood that the Democratic hope of electing Cleveland rests on New York, New Jersey and Connecticut, all of which states are necessary to add to the solid south in order to elect him."

The last two weeks of this memorable campaign exhausted all the ingenuity and energy of the contesting parties. The Republicans pressed the tariff issue, and the Democrats dodged. Mr. Blaine made from six to eighteen speeches daily, arousing wild enthusiasm. A fitting climax of his great western tour was the ovation he received in Chicago. Such a hurricane of welcome has not often been witnessed on this continent. Wednesday, October 29, occurred that remarkable and historical meeting in New York city between Mr. Blaine and a large delegation of clergymen, 125 in number, who called to pay their respects. Mr. Blaine was deeply moved, and with moistened eyes replied to the speeches of welcome. Rev. Dr. Burchard was one of the clergymen who spoke. In the course of his remarks he spoke of Democracy as the bulwark of "Rum, Romanism and Rebellion"—an illiteration that cost Mr. Blaine ten thousand votes in New York city and helped to lose the electoral vote of New York state. That trivial and yet historical incident, together with the twenty thousand prohibitory party votes in New York state, elected Grover Cleveland president.

Twenty-four years had elapsed since Buchanan the last Democratic president went out of office. That quarter of a century had witnessed a marvelous and unparalleled national growth. The Republican party had waged a successful war to preserve the union; it had abolished slavery; it had restored the national currency and credit; paid two-thirds of the cost of the rebellion; and given the country wonderful prosperity. Nevertheless the Democratic party was restored to power. This restoration was due to a variety of causes. Aside from the advantages possessed by the Democrats in having a solid south, the Republicans were weakened by the depression of business and the inevitable grievances and dissensions that arise from the possession of power, patronage and responsibility. To this were added the Prohibitory diversion and the Burchard blunder.



BENJ. HARRISON. JAS. G. BLAINE.
R. P. BLAND. S. S. COX.

Mr. Blaine received his defeat philosophically. In a speech devoid of bitterness, he simply invited the attention of the people to the results of the election in the restoration of the country to that status of parties which obtained a quarter of a century ago. Mr. Blaine clearly pointed out the fact that the south had thirty-seven electoral votes on the strength of the colored voters "whose votes it disallows wherever decisive." Mr. Blaine was cheerful, but Maine was in mourning. Subsequent events proved that the defeat of the Republicans was a national calamity.

The last session of the 48th congress met the first Monday in December. President Arthur's message was sound, business-like, devoid of verbiage and containing many wise suggestions. Mr. Dingley observed that "the imposition of responsibility has brought out in Mr. Arthur broad and statesmanlike qualities which the country gratefully recognizes."

Mr. Dingley this winter, took up his Washington residence in the Hamilton house where many New England residents lived. Here in the pleasant sunny rooms overlooking Franklin Square, corner of Fourteenth and K streets, he lived for fifteen sessions consecutively. It was his Washington home. It was the center of a life he loved. With his devoted wife and daughter by his side, he plunged deeper than ever into the labors of congressional life. He invariably walked to and from the capitol, partook of a light lunch (usually bread and milk) in the house restaurant, was always abstemious at dinner, and retired promptly at 10 o'clock. Regular habits and plenty of sleep fortified him against the exhaustive and nervous work incident to official life.

As a rule congress accomplishes little business, aside from passing the regular appropriation bills, during the short session. This session was no exception. Samuel Randall, as chairman of the appropriation committee, was really the dictator of congress; and through his control of the Democratic majority, controlled legislation. Morrison and Randall acted together to prevent congress from doing anything. But on the 15th of December, the committee on banking and currency succeeded in securing a two-thirds vote in favor of a resolution to set apart January 15 for the consideration of the McPherson bill to permit national banks to receive from the comptroller of the treasury a circulation equal to the par value of the bonds deposited; and the Dingley bill which its author explained was a bill "to authorize the secretary of the treasury to invest certain lawful money deposited in the treasury by national banks which is being accumulated under the following circum-

stances: under the law as it exists today, when national banks fail, or go into liquidation, or when they propose to retire any part of their circulation, and to withdraw the bonds which have been deposited as security, they are required to deposit in the treasury lawful money to the amount of their circulating notes outstanding.

* * * The government holds this fund for the purpose of redeeming the circulating notes, and whatever portion of the fund may remain after the circulating notes shall have been presented for redemption, goes to the government and not to the banks. Within two years this fund will be seventy-five million dollars. This will seriously contract the currency. The bill reported by the committee proposes to remedy these difficulties by authorizing the secretary of the treasury to invest so much of this fund as he may think proper in United States bonds, these bonds and the accruing interest to be held for the same purpose as the lawful money deposited. This will release the large amount of money so deposited and restore it to the channels of circulation."

The house adjourned for the holiday recess December 24 and re-assembled January 5th. Mr. Dingley remained quietly in Washington during this period, devoting his entire time to deep study. He was conscientiously industrious and nothing of importance in public affairs escaped him. Mr. Blaine was in Washington completing the second volume of his "Twenty Years of Congress," and Mr. Dingley frequently called upon him to renew pleasant acquaintances and discuss national politics. One of the few social functions Mr. Dingley attended this winter, was a reception given by Mr. Blaine at the Windom mansion in the month of January, to the judges of the supreme court, cabinet officers, senators and representatives, foreign ministers and others prominent in public life. At this reception Mr. Dingley took a modest part in the serious discussion of affairs, partook sparingly of refreshments and excused himself promptly at 10 o'clock. While fond of social intercourse he was not fond of the formal affairs where simplicity gave way to indigestion.

For nearly a month the house "marked time." The most interesting events were the defeat of the Mexican pension bill, the Hiscock free tobacco and brandy bill and the bankruptcy bill. Mr. Randall made a southern tour as the champion of a high tariff and the friend of free tobacco and whiskey; but the house declined to accept his platform. The inter-state commerce bill which passed the house the middle of January, marked a new departure in national control. A slight tariff debate late in the month, created a

bit of a sensation, Mr. Dorsheimer, President Cleveland's special friend, coming out for tariff reduction and a reciprocity treaty. This indicated that Mr. Cleveland would throw his influence against the Randall protective tariff Democrats, and that Carlisle would be the speaker of the next house.

The defeat of the McPherson bill and the Dingley bill, both designed to stop the contraction of the currency, alarmed financiers who saw that this contraction, together with the forced coinage of silver, were rapidly carrying the country away from a gold to a silver basis. Silver certificates sold at a discount in New York and little gold was used in paying debts. Nevertheless the policy of the party was to do nothing, save pass the appropriation bills. It was, therefore, somewhat ludicrous for the house to get into a controversy with the senate over the question of prerogatives—whether the senate had power to originate appropriation bills. The house Democrats were particularly sensitive on this point. They brought forth the dusty volumes of history to maintain the dignity of the house, whereupon Mr. Reed of Maine, in reply to speeches reflecting on the senate, remarked, amid applause, that he hardly thought it necessary for the house to go hunting around for more business. "For my part," said Mr. Reed, "I have not seen anything in the history of the house of representatives since I have been a member of it that should make me feel inclined to insist on more bills originating in it. We are today so clogged with the business which legitimately belongs to us that under our present system of working we do absolutely nothing. If then, we should undertake to shut off the senate from what is their plain constitutional right, I am afraid we should exhibit to the country a still worse instance of ineffectuality than we do today."

The Republicans carried their point and the house refused to instruct the committee on judiciary to defend its dignity. The bankruptcy bill and the river and harbor bill were the bones of contention. The supporters of the latter measure were repulsed by the members of the appropriation committee. As the session grew to a close, the "scenes" on the floor of the house became more frequent. The assistance of the sergeant-at-arms was frequently invoked to preserve order. The lower house was under high pressure. The demands made upon the Democratic leaders were tremendous, and angry members made dire threats. The atmosphere was charged with personalities. Mr. Cleveland was soon to be inaugurated and the country was agitated over the possibilities that might follow the change. A panic seemed to take possession of

the Democratic party, and the whole country was in a feverish condition. The house majority defeated an attempt to admit duty-free (by draw-back) raw material entering into American manufactures to be exported notwithstanding the "free raw material" attitude taken by the party. The majority of the ways and means committee declined to report Mr. Dingley's bill providing for the admission free of duty of materials for the equipment of vessels for foreign trade, notwithstanding the charge that "the tariff prevents us from building vessels as cheap as foreign nations."

The liveliest scene of this session was on Monday, February 2nd. It was suspension day, and scores of members were anxious to get their pet bills before the house. To make the matter more complicated, Speaker Carlisle was unable to be present, and failed to place in the hands of Speaker pro-tempore Blackburn, a list of men he had promised to recognize. As soon as it was known that the original program was to be departed from, there was a grand rush for Blackburn. Demands for recognition were made on every hand. Threats were made. Echoes of the loud and desperate talk in the speaker's room reached the corridor. Then out rushed Blackburn followed by hordes of members. The struggle began on the floor. The friends of the bankruptcy bill saw that unless a motion to take a recess which would extend suspension day to Tuesday, could be carried, their bill was doomed. Mr. Collins of Massachusetts, the leader, mustered his forces and made an attempt but it failed. Discomfited, they withdrew and determined to compel the house to take up the bankruptcy bill or stay there all night. One by one the tired and sleepy members glanced at the clock, then hurried home to dinner, until only a handful of desperate obstructors on each side stood facing each other. Nine o'clock came, motions to adjourn and to take a recess being defeated one after another. The house was in a deadlock. It refused to do business or adjourn. The members sat there hour after hour, now glaring at each other, now relieving themselves with laughter, and at all times utterly ignoring the tremendous thump of the speaker's gavel. Ten o'clock, eleven o'clock came. There was no adjournment. Sleepy members began to stretch themselves out on the desks and seats. The air was blue with smoke, and from the gallery the scene resembled a battle-field. Again and again a motion was made to adjourn, the roll called and the motion defeated. Midnight came and they were still at it. It was discovered that there was no quorum and a call of the house was ordered. In the course of half an hour a number of absent ones, with sleepy eyes and dis-

sheveled hair, some with no collar, others scantily clad, were forcibly brought to the house. Mr. Dingley departed early from this scene of revelry. He knew the house would accomplish no business and felt that he was safe from intrusion in his hotel. Mr. Reed also retired early but did not escape the officers of the law. His rooms were in the top story of the Hamilton house; and from the windows he could see the lights in the dome of the capitol. He knew the house was still struggling; and with a chuckle, he pulled down the shades, stepped to the speaking-tube and shouted to the clerk: "If anybody comes for me tell them I am not in this evening." He was soon fast asleep. Suddenly there came a thump on the door. Then another thump followed. Then a voice at the key-hole said: "Mr. Reed! Mr. Reed!" There was no response only a soft "sh-sh" within. Then the officer of the law departed not in an angelic state of mind. As soon as the sounds had disappeared in the distance Mr. Reed quietly arose from his couch, stole to the speaking tube and said softly to the clerk: "Have-they-gone?" Receiving an affirmative answer he said: "Then bring me some ice water." And he disappeared in the darkness of the chamber. It was nearly half past two Tuesday morning when the house finally agreed to adjourn.

Mr. Dingley watched his opportunity to assist the shipping interests of the country, when the post-office appropriation bill was under consideration. Mr. Hunt of Louisiana had, on the 9th of February, called the attention of the house to the liberality of Great Britain in promoting her shipping interests engaged in the foreign trade, by means of liberal mail pay. On the following day (February 10) Mr. Dingley addressed the house in advocacy of that section of the bill which provides for generous mail pay to American lines of steamers engaged in the foreign trade.¹ He discussed the policy of other countries and answered every objection raised. "A nation of fifty-six million people," he said, "occupying so high a place among the powers of christendom and proudly boasting of a future, of which no other country ever dreamed, ought not to be content until her mails are carried to other nations by steamships floating her own flag. * * * The same policy of liberal mail pay which has built up British steamship lines on all the great routes of ocean commerce, and nothing else, will, if persistently followed, secure to the United States similar results." The debate on this paragraph of the bill continued for several days. The section was assailed bitterly, and by a vote of 105 to 97, was stricken

1—See Appendix.

from the bill. This result was greeted with applause by the Democrats.

When the legislative appropriation bill was under consideration, Mr. Dingley, ever watchful of the interests of American shipping, discovered that the annual salary of the commissioner of navigation had been cut down from four thousand dollars to three thousand six hundred dollars. He moved to amend the bill by striking out "three thousand six hundred dollars" and inserting "four thousand dollars." He said "the act creating this bureau was passed at the last session of congress and provided a salary of four thousand dollars. Upon the unanimous report of a committee and by a two-thirds vote of both houses this salary was fixed; and we ought not now in an appropriation bill to make this reduction." Mr. Dingley added that the duties were administrative, not clerical. "If the house," he said, "after a thorough consideration of the matter should see fit to change the law on this subject, that would be a different question. The officer entered upon his duties with the understanding that the salary should be four thousand dollars." But Mr. Dingley's amendment was defeated.

On the 16th the house passed a bill designed to prevent outside speculators from obtaining and sub-letting mail contracts. In advocating this bill Mr. Dingley said: "It is in the public interest to have the mails carried by contractors living in the immediate vicinity of the routes, and of giving personal attention to the same. Where out-of-state speculators bid off mail lines on speculation, they are inclined to sub-let to parties having inadequate equipment, and whenever irregularities or difficulties arise there is generally a long delay in correcting them."

Mr. Holman's paragraph in the legislative appropriation bill, limiting the compensation of custom officers of several ports to the fees, was opposed by Mr. Dingley on the ground that it would take away the custom houses and officials from several ports which are necessary for fishing and coasting vessels. Mr. Dingley's time expired and Mr. Long of Massachusetts courteously yielded his time to the member from Maine. As a result the proposition of Mr. Holman was defeated.

February 26 was a stormy day in the house. The fight was over a paragraph in the sundry civil appropriation bill authorizing the president to suspend the coinage of silver dollars. The house refused to consider the proposition at all and it was stricken from the bill. As this was Mr. Cleveland's own plan, its defeat caused much comment, as it showed a division in the Democratic ranks on this

important currency issue. Two days later the subject was touched upon incidentally, and Mr. Horr, the wag of the house, congratulated the Democrats that Mr. Cleveland should begin his administration by getting on the Republican platform. "I hold here," said Mr. Horr, "a letter—the first message given by the incoming president to the congress of the United States, if I may call it a message. I find in this message nothing but words of wisdom. To my astonishment almost every line of it commends itself to my judgment, and the one thing I regret is that such pearls had to be cast before such—congressmen. I do not know what the notions of the incoming president are on the fortification bill. Has any member here a message from him on that subject? Did the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Springer) speak to me?"

"No, sir," said Mr. Springer, "I am not casting pearls now."

Smarting under the lash of sarcasm and ridicule, the Democratic leaders parried the thrusts of Mr. Horr. Mr. Dorsheimer said he should have preferred that the president had waited until he had been inaugurated before sending a message to congress. Mr. Warner came to the rescue of Mr. Dorsheimer, and declared he disagreed with the president-elect as to the danger of silver coinage. Thus the contest over the silver question was again foreshadowed; and the serious disagreement between Mr. Cleveland and a majority of his party which resulted in his political retirement, became more and more apparent. The decision of the house on the silver question during these closing hours of congress, was significant and ill-omened.

The peril of an extra session of congress was removed by the recession of the house from its antagonism to the ocean steamship mail pay paragraph of the post-office appropriation bill, and its concurrence with the senate. For this victory of American shipping, great credit was due Mr. Dingley. This measure was one of the few important matters wrested from the forty-eighth congress. The fight to secure it during the closing hours of this session was tremendous. There were only nine votes to spare, after a long and sharp running debate. The last three days of this congress were crowded with business. Confusion seemed to be supreme; but out of it all, the appropriation bills were saved with the exception of the river and harbor bill. The forty-eighth congress expired by limitation at noon March 4, Speaker Carlisle delivering his valedictory; and President Cleveland was inaugurated.

The light was burning brightly in the dome of the capitol as the morning broke on the 4th of March. The jaded legislators were still

at their desk when the troops began to assemble at the forming places. The day was the most beautiful of the year. The sky was cloudless, and the air was soft and balmy. The senate chamber was early in readiness for the distinguished party. Twenty thousand people with up-turned faces, stood in the space east of the capitol. To this multitude and to the entire nation, the first Democratic president since 1856 delivered his inaugural address. But curiously enough, President Cleveland's message was assailed by his own party and endorsed by the Republicans. A delegation of Republican congressmen hastened to the White House to assure the new president that the Republicans were especially pleased with his soundness on the silver question. Thus President Cleveland's estrangement from his party began the first day of his term.

Mr. Dingley was fifty-three years old on the 15th of February, and he recorded in his diary: "I feel as young as I did thirty years ago." It was a remarkable fact that in the midst of exciting public duties and under strain of incessant mental labor, Mr. Dingley maintained perfect health. He returned to his home in Lewiston, two days after congress adjourned. He was always happy in the editorial chair; and in the intervals between public duties, wrote for the Lewiston Journal sound and able leaders that were quoted freely by the state papers.

June 16, the general conference of the Congregational churches of Maine met in Lewiston. Mr. Dingley, responding to the invitation of the moderator of the conference said that "the preaching of today is as sound, faithful and spiritual as it was seventy-five years ago, when church-going was more general than now. The church has not lost any of its zeal, nor the gospel any of its old power. How does it happen, then, that there is a large and increasing number of non-church attendants in both city and country? It is partly because of immigration and partly because the conditions of life are changed, while the churches are pursuing their old methods of work. Formerly most of our population lived on farms. The invention of machinery by which farm work is done with less manual labor, and the cheap transportation which has brought western farm produce so cheaply to our doors, has carried the boys and girls in large numbers from off the farm, and taken them into the manufacturing villages and cities, of which we had none seventy-five years ago. Young men and women away from home in cities do not go to the city churches because they have not parental influence to lead them to church. The old method is good for church-going people; nothing better was ever discovered to pro-

mote spiritual welfare; but you have got to add some instrumentality to the old agencies in order to reach those outside the church. The preaching is as sound and spiritual, but the people are not in the churches to hear it; neither will free seats bring them in. Something must be done. You may have more consecrated men in the churches, but that will not bring in non church-goers. You have got to go out after them. The Young Men's Christian associations and other organizations have already been at work in this direction. Whatever agency may be resorted to, it should be under the guidance of the church. Whatever may be said of the work of such organizations, as the Salvation army, they are certainly reaching for good, many whom the ordinary agencies of the church cannot reach. They should not be opposed, but guided, moulded and used by the church itself. We should remember that even their parades and drum-beatings have in view simply the drawing into their meetings of the masses who cannot be persuaded to enter a church, in order that they may be reached by the gospel truths presented in such a way it clearly finds lodgment in the hearts of many. We should welcome, use, sustain and guide any and all methods of christian work which reach the masses, and this is what we should do to the Salvation army." This sentiment was greeted with applause.

Late in July it was announced from Washington that Postmaster General Vilas had declined to increase the compensation of American steamship lines for carrying the mails. The substance of his excuse was that English steamship lines would carry our mails for the annual compensation then paid, and second that the act of the last congress did not furnish a sufficiently definite basis for action. Mr. Dingley thus commented editorially: "To the first excuse, it is sufficient to reply that it was understood by the last congress that British steamship lines, supported in part by large mail pay appropriations of the British government, would carry our mails without compensation, if they could thereby extinguish or prevent the establishment of American steamship lines. The second excuse is brushed aside by the terms of the law which gives the postmaster general full authority to use not exceeding \$400,000. Postmaster General Vilas and the administration cannot avoid their full responsibility. It is an open secret that the real reason for non-action is hostility to the plan of aiding in maintaining American steamship lines by liberal mail pay."

The death of General U. S. Grant July 23rd, cast a gloom over the whole nation. Mr. Dingley wrote of the departed soldier: "As

the imperturbable leader of our armies in the great contest which ended so triumphantly for the rights of men, General Grant was honored while living, and his death is the death of a citizen of the world to whom every man struggling against caste and prejudice owes a debt which happily for justice to his great name, the masses of the people on both sides of the sea, are not slow to acknowledge."

Mr. Dingley found much rest and recreation at his island home; but his recreation often consisted of writing editorials and addresses. July 25th he delivered the opening address at the annual mass meeting of the Friends of Temperance at Sebago lake, near Portland. His address was on "The First Centennial of the Temperance Movement in the United States—a Review of the Progress of a Hundred years, and a Glance at the Future of the Temperance Reform." ¹ Temperance meetings and political conferences occupied a large part of Mr. Dingley's time during August and September.

The result of the state elections in eleven states on the third of November, indicated very little change in party strength from that shown in the presidential election of a year previous. The leading feature of the elections was the restoration of Tammany to the control of the Democratic party in New York. With David B. Hill governor, Tammany was "on top," and Mr. Dingley observed: "We doubt not that what seems to many Democrats a victory, will in the end only serve to make the Democratic overthrow complete in the early future." October 14th he attended a meeting of the Republican state committee at Augusta, and dined with Mr. Blaine. October 21st he gave the address of welcome at the state Sabbath school convention at Auburn. On the 15th of November he dined at his brother Frank's to celebrate their father's 76th birthday. His devotion and tenderness to his father and to his children was rare. He never failed to write a loving birthday letter to his only daughter, to whom he referred in his diary as the "sole daughter of my house and heart."

Thanksgiving day brought its usual joys. The family—grandfather, two sons, Nelson and Frank, and eleven sons and daughters, sat down to a bountiful repast, at the Congressman's home, where good health and happiness abounded. December 3rd, Mr. Dingley started for Washington, leaving his devoted wife to watch at the bed-side of his second son who was seriously ill. Silent prayer comforted him on his lonely journey.

1—See Appendix.

CHAPTER XV.

1885-1887.

The death of Vice President Thomas A. Hendricks, November 25th, 1885, following so soon the assassination of Lincoln and Garfield, joined to the fact that two presidents had previously died in office, reminded the country that rulers in a republic are as liable to die during their terms as kings and emperors, and that it is the part of wisdom to provide for such contingencies by law. Had President Cleveland died then, there would have been no official authorized to take up the reins of government. There was no president pro tempore of the senate and no speaker of the house. This startling situation resulted shortly after, in the passage of the presidential succession bill, whereby the different members of the cabinet succeeded to the presidency after the death of the president and vice president.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Republicans were in a minority in the forty-ninth congress, and therefore the Democratic candidate for speaker would be elected, nevertheless the Republicans held a caucus the Saturday before congress met, to select a candidate for speaker. As the nomination was regarded as indicating the man whom the Republicans would look to as a leader, and a probable future candidate for speaker, there was no little interest manifested. The names mentioned were Reed of Maine, Hiscock of New York, Long of Massachusetts and McKinley of Ohio. Reed was always looked to as a leader in a partisan debate, his great powers of sarcasm giving him peculiar advantage in such a rough and tumble war of words. He seemed to be the favorite; and on the day of the caucus was nominated for speaker by a vote

of sixty-three to forty-two for Hiscock. His nomination was not an empty honor. It gave him prestige as the leader on the Republican side. In accepting the nomination, Mr. Reed simply bowed his acknowledgement. In his selection Mr. Dingley played an important part.

Congress assembled December 7 with the usual ceremony. John G. Carlisle was elected speaker, and his address to the house expressed his confidence that the Democratic congress would be able to "lighten the burdens of the people, reform abuses in the public service, complete the restoration of confidence and fraternal feeling among the people in all sections of the country, and give such assurances for a wise and patriotic policy as will guarantee a long life of Democratic administration." Mr. Carlisle changed his mind before congress adjourned.

President Cleveland's message was a disappointment to his own party, and enigmatical to the Republicans. No light was thrown upon the issues of free trade and protection. The President first dodged the issue and then declared there was before the administration no economic issue whatever of protection or free trade. Mr. Dingley observed: "The president talks of protection in the interest of the masses of the people and of the importance of reducing the revenue, and yet when the question comes up for practical solution the Democrats prefer to continue the tariff on sugar, which is an uncalled-for tax on the plain people. The program of the Democratic party in congress has been to make sugar dear and to make whiskey cheap. The perils of the party that undertakes to govern the country and to deny that protection is an issue, will be seen gradually to accumulate as time rolls on. A party out of power, may continue out of power without a constructive policy, as the history of bourbonism reveals; but, in power, something other than negations is required."

In this house were Hilary A. Herbert, William C. Oates and Joseph Wheeler of Alabama; Joseph McKenna of California, subsequently appointed justice of the United States supreme court; Henry G. Turner, Charles F. Crisp and James H. Blount of Georgia; A. J. Hopkins, Robert R. Hitt, Thomas J. Henderson, Lewis E. Payson, William M. Springer, Joseph G. Cannon and William R. Morrison of Illinois; William S. Holman, William B. Bynum and George W. Steele of Indiana; David B. Henderson, (later speaker of the house), J. B. Weaver and William P. Hepburn of Iowa; William P. Breckinridge and J. G. Carlisle of Kentucky; Thomas B. Reed, Nelson Dingley Jr., Seth L. Milliken and Charles

A. Boutelle of Maine; John D. Long, P. A. Collins, Charles A. Allen, William W. Rice and William Whiting of Massachusetts; James O'Donnell, J. C. Burrows, Edwin B. Winans, Byron M. Cutcheon and Spencer O. Fisher of Michigan; Knute Nelson of Minnesota; Richard P. Bland of Missouri; William Walter Phelps of New Jersey, later ambassador to Germany, and William McAdoo from the same state; Perry Belmont, Joseph Pulitzer, Abram S. Hewitt and S. E. Payne of New York; Benjamin Butterworth, James E. Campbell, Charles H. Grosvenor, A. J. Warner and William McKinley Jr., of Ohio; Henry H. Bingham, Samuel J. Randall, William B. Kelley, Andrew G. Curtin, Thomas M. Bayne of Pennsylvania; Benton McMillin and James D. Richardson of Tennessee; James H. Reagan and R. Q. Mills of Texas; George D. Wise and John W. Daniels of Virginia; Nathan Goff Jr., and William L. Wilson of West Virginia.

Debate over the proposed new rules occupied several days, during which Mr. Dingley sought to secure an amendment creating a committee on navigation and fisheries, but without avail. The most important amendment to the new rules was the granting to a majority of the house the power to determine what business shall be taken up and prohibiting general legislation in the forms of riders to appropriation bills.

Congress adjourned for the holidays the day before Christmas, but Mr Dingley was obliged to return to Maine December 18, because of the dangerous illness of his second son. The scene at that bedside when the devoted and anxious father entered the sick room, will never be forgotten. The father knelt beside his son and put his arms tenderly about the wasted body. The anxious and weary mother stood near. Both uttered a silent prayer for the recovery of their boy, and the prayer was heard. The crisis was passed and the son was soon restored to health.

The legislative reunion at Augusta early in January, 1886, was the event of the winter. Mr. Dingley was to take a prominent part and on the afternoon of January 5th started for Augusta. There he was the guest of Mr. Blaine. The reception was held in representative hall, Governor Robie and former Governors Hamlin, Dingley, Connor and Plaisted forming the receiving party. The exercises the next day were exceptionally interesting. Some of the most noted men of the state were present, several of them well advanced in years. Hannibal Hamlin, John C. Talbot, N. W. Farwell, Nathaniel Wilson, William Dickey and Solon Chase made short addresses. Mr. Dingley gave interesting reminiscences of the

war sessions of the legislature from 1861 to 1865. He said he had looked forward to this occasion with more than ordinary interest and had delayed his departure for Washington for the purpose of attending. He first became a member of the legislature in the first year of the civil war. At that time Hon. Bion Bradbury, Hon. George P. Sewell, Hon. A. P. Gould and many other able men were members of the house. In the senate among others were Hon. John A. Peters and Hon. N. A. Farwell. Over the house presided Hon. J. G. Blaine. He said that the experience to be gained in a legislature composed of such able men as these was valuable. The questions to be met at that time were not those of ordinary legislation but questions of the life and death of the nation. It was a session which he could never forget, and it was a pleasure to him to meet some of those who sat in these halls at that time. During the years he had served in the legislature he had formed the friendships of men now scattered throughout the union, friendships which had not only continued but strengthened and increased as the years had gone by. No friendships formed in the ordinary relations of life are stronger or more lasting than those formed in legislative halls. Nothing would have deterred him, except actual necessity, from being present. He thanked those who had conceived the project of a reunion and made it so successful.

Mr. Dingley also spoke at the banquet, the other speakers being Mr. Blaine, Mr. Hamlin, Governor Robie, W. W. Thomas, Charles Hamlin, Selden Connor, A. P. Morrill and others. Hon. J. H. Drummond was toastmaster. Mr. Dingley said: "I suppose the toastmaster's reference was whether we consider it a misfortune to be promoted from a legislative body of this state to congress. If I were to answer that question I should want to consider it in two or three points of view. If I were consulted personally, I should say it was a misfortune, for it has already been stated by my friend Mr. Blaine, that no ex-member of our house of representatives who has been transferred to congress has had any other view of the promotion than that he has been deprived of the greatest pleasure of his life. It is true, my friends, that in one point of view it is a promotion, but it is also true in congress, as has been said here, there is no such thing as deliberation in the transaction of business. It is so to a certain extent in the senate of the United States, but it is increased in the house. Deliberation in the latter body is practically an impossibility, and I appeal to gentlemen who have been present if it does not very nearly represent a bear garden. It is true that we here in our house of representatives delib-

erate in the transaction of business. Every man who has anything to say, gets a hearing. Few members get a hearing in the house of representatives of the United States. Occasionally we have something approaching the debates that we have here but very rarely. You who have visited Washington, and looking down upon the house from the galleries, have observed some gentleman of considerable reputation sawing the air, and repeating the words to go to his constituents, and, apparently, not a solitary member listening to what is being said. Now, I must confess that I do not like that way of doing business. The legislation there is transacted in committees and not in open house. Occasionally some question of great importance, commanding the attention of the country, does receive some degree of deliberation, but not usually. Therefore, I say that in that point of view, a great pleasure is taken away from any member who may be transferred from the legislature of this state to congress. But then, of course when you ask me, for example, if I am ready to step down and out, and come back here, I say we all have a little idea that there is something a little more elevated in it, although it is not quite so agreeable and we stick to it. As Jefferson once said, few die, and none resign."

The occasion was made still more interesting and historical by the presentation to the state of a portrait in oil of Lot M. Morrill. The presentation speech was made by the venerable former United States senator, James W. Bradbury. The grand ball was led by Hannibal Hamlin, then 76 years old. That night the week's festivities, a success from inception to close, came to end.

Thursday before the program was concluded, Mr. Dingley started for Washington, arriving in time to hear the announcement of the committees on the following day. Speaker Carlisle placed Mr. Dingley on his old committees—banking and currency and American ship building. The shipping committee was almost entirely re-constructed by the speaker. Free ship Democrats like Holman of Indiana, Mills of Texas and McMillin of Tennessee, were substituted for the Democrats who in the last congress followed Mr. Dingley in opposing free ships. Speaker Carlisle and Mr. Morrison were chagrined in the previous congress to find that their shipping committee had reported against free ships, and the speaker took particular pains this session to make the committee strongly in favor of allowing foreign built ships to take an American registry.

In speaking of the outlook for legislation Mr. Dingley said that he did not expect any important financial legislation. In regard to

the silver coinage law he thought that there would be no change until some financial calamity occurred to open the eyes of congressmen.

Mr. Dingley's interest in American shipping never waned. On the 28th of January he secured consideration of his bill to abolish certain fees for official services to American vessels, and to amend the laws relating to shipping commissioners, seamen and owners of vessels. ¹ This bill was unanimously reported from the select committee on American shipping. Mr. Dingley explained the bill, section by section, and displayed a minute knowledge of shipping law and navigation regulations.

He was busy all day, February 4, fighting dangerous amendments; and by his rare skill and diplomacy secured the passage of the bill substantially as it came from the committee. This bill passed the senate May 17, with amendments, and Messrs. Miller, Dolph and Vest were appointed conferees on the part of the senate. The house committee voted to recommend non-concurrence in most of the senate amendments. This was not through opposition to the amendments but for the purpose of protecting them in conference. May 25th Mr. Dingley reported the bill to the house with the recommendation that some of the amendments be concurred in and others rejected, and that conferees be appointed. The speaker appointed Messrs. Dingley, Dunn and McMillin conferees on the part of the house. Mr. Dingley was the leading spirit in the conference held May 26th, and succeeded by his superior knowledge, in carrying a majority of the conferees with him. On the following day, he presented the conference report to the house, and explained it. The amendment "authorizing the president to withdraw commercial privileges in our ports from the vessels of any foreign country to the extent that such privileges are denied to the vessels of the United States in the ports of such foreign countries," caused some debate. Mr. Dingley explained that "in view of the fact that Canada is attempting to discriminate against American fishing vessels by depriving them of certain commercial privileges which we freely allow Canadian vessels in our ports, it is proposed by this section simply to extend the authority already given the president by the act of 1823. * * * If Canada or any other country shall come to understand that her vessels can obtain full privileges in our ports without corresponding return on her part, then we shall have her vessels coming into our ports and claiming these privileges, while our vessels in her ports are denied similar

1—See Appendix.

privileges, and she will simply laugh at us." Mr. Dingley reiterated his statement that the amendment did not undertake to settle the pending controversy in regard to the fisheries between the United States and Canada. The report was agreed to in the house and also in the senate; and on the 19th of June President Cleveland signed the bill. This law, enacted through the efforts of Mr. Dingley, was a great boon to the shipping interests of the country. The Portland Advertiser said: "Mr. Dingley's work in behalf of American shipping deserves great praise, for in a quiet way he has managed to pass bills raising an annual burden of a million and a half dollars on American ships."

The president in his message, recommended the passage of a bill authorizing him to appoint a commission to negotiate a treaty with Great Britain to settle the question of fishing grounds on the Canadian and American coasts, and to make arrangements relative to trade with Canada. It was well understood that the real purpose of the commission on the part of Canada was to secure a treaty for the free admission of Canadian fish into our markets. Mr. Dingley foreshadowed the strong opposition that would be made by American fishermen, by presenting in the house the protest of a large number of fishermen and citizens of Maine against any such arrangement. The memorial was signed by a number of citizens of Maine "who feel a deep interest in the preservation and encouragement of the sea fisheries which have always proved so valuable a nursery of seamen to man our national vessels in case of war." The signers represented that "these fishing interests have seriously declined during recent years, largely in consequence of the disastrous competition of Canadian fish, which, under treaty arrangements, have until recently, been admitted into the markets of the United States without the payment of any duty." It was pointed out that the advantages to be obtained by American fishermen were never realized, and that the arrangements had been terminated July 1st, 1885; "and that Canadian fish have ever since been charged the same duty as fish brought into our markets by other foreign fishermen." The memorialists "respectfully protest against any treaty, arrangement or legislation which would admit Canadian fish into American markets free of duty. We urge this not simply because of the importance of the industry, which cannot maintain itself in open, free competition with the cheaper labor and cheaper vessels and supplies of Canadians engaged in this industry, but also and especially because it is a nursery of seamen from which the nation has in the past drawn the men that have defended our

flag on the ocean in time of war; and which it is as essential to maintain as a resource and defence in case of a conflict with naval powers as it is to erect forts and build a navy."

Interest in the proposed fisheries commission increased. Mr. Dingley said that "the friends of the fishing interests of New England are steadily gaining in strength in the house. In the senate the Republican majority has been steadily opposed to any commission looking to the admission of Canadian fish free of duty from the beginning, and there has been no fear that any commission bill that the house would pass, could pass the senate. The largely signed remonstrances from the lake region against any commission looking to free Canadian fish, which have recently poured into the house, have so strengthened the friends that I am satisfied we can beat the commission in the house, as many Democrats are coming over to us. Indeed, it would not surprise me if the administration found the job of carrying a commission so hopeless that Secretary Bayard would intimate to Mr. Belmont of the foreign affairs committee that the matter had better be allowed to die in committee." The proposition was allowed to die.

Early in April, agitation over the vexed fishery question was renewed by the policy of the Dominion government in prohibiting any fishing vessel of the United States from entering Dominion harbors except for the purpose of shelter, repairs, and purchase of wood and water. Several seizures of American fishing vessels were made by the Canadian authorities and the situation was somewhat strained. Mr. Dingley called Secretary Bayard's attention to the violation by the Dominion of the treaty of 1844, and the secretary agreed that the Dominion had overstepped the bounds in these three respects: in warning American vessels from Canadian waters though not engaged in the fishing trade; in denying the right to enter these ports for trade, and in refusing to American fishing vessels the right to land fish caught in deep water for shipment to the United States in bond. This was in direct opposition to the agreement made in 1850 between the two nations that the vessels of each should have the freedom of the ports of the other.

April 5th, Mr. Dingley introduced the following resolution in the house: "Resolved, that the president be requested to furnish the house, if compatible with the public interests, with any information in his possession relative to the exclusion of American shipping vessels from the ports of entry of the Dominion of Canada for the purpose of trading, purchasing supplies or landing fish caught in deep water for shipment in bond to the United States, or doing

other acts which Canada and other British vessels are freely permitted to do in ports of the United States, and also to inform the house what steps have been taken or are proposed to bring such unwarrantable and unfriendly acts of the Dominion authorities to the attention of the British government."

Mr. Dingley made an argument before the committee on foreign affairs in favor of his resolution, and the resolution (with the preamble eliminated) was unanimously adopted and reported to the house. April 16, the resolution was reached and Mr. Dingley spoke in favor of its adoption.¹ He traced the history of the controversy and pointed out clearly wherein Canada was violating a solemn agreement with the United States. "It is time," he said, "that the interests of American fishermen should be scrupulously and persistently guarded as the similar interests of other nations are guarded by them. Considered simply as an industry to supply food to our people, our fisheries are of great importance. But their value as a resource in time of war cannot be over-estimated." The resolution was adopted.

The seizure of Gloucester and Portland fishing vessels by a Canadian vessel, precipitated matters, and Mr. Dingley on the 10th of May introduced in the house a bill "to limit the commercial privileges of vessels of foreign countries in the ports of the United States for such purposes as are accorded to American vessels in the ports of such foreign countries." The bill was referred to the committee on American ship building. In the meantime Senator Frye secured the adoption of an amendment to the Dingley shipping bill covering the same point. This amendment was rejected by the house, but finally agreed to in conference; and formed a part of the Dingley shipping bill that passed both houses May 27th.

Seizures of American shipping vessels continued, and steps were taken by New England fishermen to protect themselves if the government declined so to do. Secretary Bayard claimed that he was doing everything in his power; but the season was rapidly advancing and nothing was done. Mr. Dingley said in July, after fruitless efforts to secure action by the state department: "It must be admitted with chagrin by the American citizen that in our transactions with Great Britain relative to the fisheries, ever since 1818, the British have got the best of us; that while we have somehow or other beaten Great Britain in the settlement of other issues between the two countries, she has uniformly gained a notorious advantage in the several fishery bargains we have made with her.

1—See Appendix.

The English authorities are now using their old and successful game—the game that cost us so much in 1877—the game of delay. Here is Minister West leaving Washington for a summer's jaunt right in the midst of the troubles. English and Canadian statesmen hope by a studied system of postponements to fret us into making a reciprocity treaty with Canada. Secretary Bayard is not the man to cope with the craft of British statesmen who, having cheated us before so badly and so many times are hardly to be blamed for thinking that by their old policy of delays and evasions they can tire us out, drive us to their terms and cheat us again. In the present emergency, this country needs a quick-witted, strong-willed man in Secretary Bayard's place."

While the house had under consideration the postoffice appropriation bill, Mr. Dingley on the 30th of March, delivered an able and exhaustive speech¹ on liberal pay to American steamship lines for transportation of foreign mails. He sharply arraigned the postmaster general for the blow he had administered against American shipping by refusing to apply the foreign mail pay appropriations for the purposes designed by the last congress. He showed how protection had built up our coastwise marine and how our merchant marine had suffered from Democratic policy. This speech was a remarkable exposition of the intimate and vital relations between American shipping and American commerce, and added to Mr. Dingley's reputation as an authority on this subject.

Free trade and free ships were the shibboleths of the Democratic majority in the house. On the 25th of March a bill was reported to the house "to amend section 4132 of the revised statutes so as to authorize the purchase of foreign built ships by citizens of the United States and to permit the same to be registered as vessels of the United States." The Republican members of the committee opposed the bill and signed a minority report written by Mr. Dingley.¹ This report was an unanswerable argument against free ships and an appeal to congress to continue the motto of Washington, of Jefferson and of Madison—"American ships built in American ship yards." This bill came up in the house for discussion May 22nd. Mr. Dunn, chairman of the shipping committee, made the opening speech in favor of the bill. Mr. Dingley replied in a speech¹ of remarkable power. "Before we commit ourselves to this policy," he said, "it will be wise for us to consider that all history teaches that no people can permanently maintain their prestige unless they strengthen their position on the ocean as

1—See Appendix.

well as on the land, and that no nation can gain and maintain maritime supremacy unless it builds its own vessels." Mr. Dingley was warmly congratulated, and the bill was abandoned by its promoters.

February 2nd was set apart by the house for the consideration of resolutions in relation to the death of Vice President Hendricks. Mr. Dingley was invited to speak on this occasion. His remarks were brief but thoughtful and tender. ¹ On the afternoon of February 21 (Sunday) he addressed a large temperance meeting in Washington.

The fight against Mr. Dingley's bill to abolish compulsory pilotage in the coast-wise trade was sharp and persistent. Members of the various pilot associations were given hearings before the shipping committee; but the committee voted to report the bill. The report ¹ accompanying this bill was written by Mr. Dingley. The New York pilots attempted to secure the support of the labor organizations, but when it was found that the pilot organization was a monopoly, the labor organizations refused to be used for any such purpose. April 15, when the house had under consideration the river and harbor appropriation bill, Mr. Dingley spoke at some length ¹ in favor of removing the unnecessary pilotage fees from American coast-wise vessels. The friends of the measure however, decided not to take it up for action until an opportunity could be had to organize the shipping interests.

On the 16 of February Chairman Morrison of the ways and means committee introduced his tariff bill. Mr. Dingley called attention to the fact that "the bill professes to be a very moderate one, but it cuts Maine's industries and products fearfully. Altogether the thrusting of this new tariff revision before the country will be likely to further delay the revival of business, as few will care to make investments in industries threatened with increased foreign competition by a reduction of duties." Concerning the tariff Mr. Dingley said: "There will be a tariff bill, and I understand that Morrison and Hewitt are interested in its preparation. It will be a queer sort of combination, for they propose to make it up with a lot of things designed to please someone on the Democratic side and to embarrass our side by tacking on some changes in the law we favor. It will be a political bill, designed to unite the Democrats and afford them a chance to make the country solid for revenue reform. They do not care much whether it becomes a law or not if they can only get it through the house. They are really

in earnest because Mills of Texas has resigned his place on the shipping committee in order to devote all his time to the tariff."

April 12, Chairman Morrison reported his bill "to reduce tariff revenue." Mr. Dingley said it was the most unjust tariff measure ever presented by congress. It was framed not with any view of dealing equally and fairly with the industries of the country, but simply with a view of winning the votes of the Democratic members of the house. The industries of states represented by Republicans were mercilessly slaughtered, while even the raw products of the states represented by Democrats were left untouched.

The fate of this second Democratic tariff hung in the balance. Chairman Morrison summoned all his forces and on the 17th of June moved that the house proceed to the consideration of the bill. The motion was lost by a vote of 140 to 157. Every Republican and every Randall Democrat voted against the motion; and the announcement of the result was greeted with applause on the Republican side. Mr. Morrison, with unconcealed discomfiture, announced that he would renew the motion on the following Tuesday. Mr. McKinley promptly replied: "Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice that we will try to be here next Tuesday." Mr. Morrison and the free trade wing of the Democracy were enraged, and in secret conference denounced Mr. Randall and his thirty-five followers.

When the next Tuesday arrived, Mr. Morrison did not renew his motion, as promised, to take up the tariff bill. In place of this he proposed an amendment to the rules providing when any bill to increase pensions or to grant new pensions is before the house, "it shall be in order to provide by taxation or otherwise for the payment thereof; but no such amendment shall be in order unless the net revenue provided for shall be thereby set apart for the sole purpose of paying such increased pensions." This was simply a left-handed way of getting the tariff bill before the house and of rebuking the Republicans for what Mr. Morrison called "reckless and extravagant appropriations for pensions." President Cleveland had already vetoed scores of private pension bills, and the Democratic leaders came to the rescue of the executive in his warfare upon the old soldiers. Mr. Reed made a sharp fifteen minute speech in which he arraigned the Democrats. "They rush forward," he said, "with enormous anxiety to pay pensions and saddle them with tariff discussion! Good Heavens! What legislation on earth in the way of appropriations could stand a tariff discussion? Why, this house, by a majority of 17, in a Democratic house of 40

majority, has expressed its disgust with the subject to such an extent that although the bill was still-born, nevertheless they absolutely refused the oratorical ceremony of burial." An interesting feature of this episode was the sharp discussion between Mr. Morrison and Mr. Randall in which the latter asked the former if he thought Mr. Cleveland would have been elected if the national convention had declared for free raw wool. Mr. Morrison replied by charging Mr. Randall with betraying the principles of his party. Mr. Reed's motion to lay the proposed amendment on the table was defeated by only 13 votes, and the house adjourned amid confusion without settling the controversy. The battle was renewed on the following day; and after much filibustering, the proposition of the Democrats was defeated.

Thus Mr. Morrison again failed in the matter of tariff legislation, and on the 29th of June, Mr. Randall tried his hand. He introduced a bill purely for political purposes, as it was necessary for the protection Democrats after defeating the Morrison bill, "to get to the country," with something. But nothing was ever heard of the bill and all tariff legislation this session failed.

The Democratic party was at this time, ten years before the first "battle of the standards," committed to the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. The national Democratic platform of 1884 had declared for the "gold and silver coinage of the constitution," and the Democratic majority in the house felt compelled to give concrete expression to this declaration. Therefore a bill was reported to the house from the committee on coinage, weights and measures, permitting the free and unlimited coinage of silver dollars, 412 1-2 grains each, and repealing so much of the act of February 28th, 1878, "as provides for the purchase of silver bullion to be coined monthly into silver dollars." This was known as the Bland bill; and after a rather desultory debate, the bill was defeated by 37 majority. Thirty Republicans and ninety-six Democrats voted for it, and ninety-two Republicans and seventy-one Democrats voted against it. Mr. Dingley said: "It seems strange that a proposition to allow any holder of silver bullion to take 412 1-2 grains, nine-tenths fine, worth 79 cents in the market, to a government mint, and receive a silver dollar, should receive so large a support. It seems so plain that so long as we coin silver bullion at a profit of 21 cents on a dollar, that profit should go to the people, instead of to the owners of silver mines, that the silver mania must have turned the heads of many men. So far as can be dis-

covered from the debate, every member of congress is in favor of retaining both silver and gold in our coinage, and also in favor of doing all we can to restore silver to its old value and thus make free coinage practicable. All agree that an agreement among leading commercial nations for the use of silver in legal tender coinage will bring this about, but as to what course to take to bring this about, members differ. The great authorities who have written on bimetallism and who favor the use of both metals, agree that the best way is to temporarily suspend our coinage in order to bring a pressure to bear upon other governments which rest easy so long as we take care of the surplus silver. The decision however, is to go along as we are going until actual calamity necessitates action."

One of the important bills of the session provided for "creating boards of arbitration for the speedy settlement of controversies and differences between common carriers and their employers." Mr. Dingley supported the bill¹ on the ground that it formulated a statutory method of providing boards of arbitration and because of the moral effect which the enactment of such a law would have.

A slight incident happened in the house July 2, that illustrates Mr. Dingley's watchful care over public expenditure and his earnest desire to maintain a moral standard in every department. When the general deficiency bill was under consideration, a clause was reached appropriating \$363 for a deficiency in the expense of the government visitors to the naval academy at Annapolis. Mr. Dingley offered an amendment providing "that no part of this sum or any other appropriation by congress for expenses of the board of visitors shall be used to pay for intoxicating liquors." Mr. Adams of New York looked at Mr. Dingley curiously and said: "You do not seriously press that amendment, do you?"

"I do press it seriously," replied Mr. Dingley.

"I am surprised," said Mr. Adams.

"Are you opposed to the amendment?" inquired Mr. Dingley.

"Oh, certainly," replied Mr. Adams, with hesitation. "I shall vote against it."

Mr. Findlay of Maryland said: "If the bill is a fair and moderate one, we have no right to refuse payment simply because the officer who ordered the expenditure may have traveled outside of the rules of propriety."

"I will ask the gentleman," said Mr. Dingley, "whether any officer of the government is warranted in purchasing liquors to be paid for by the taxpayers?"

1—See Appendix.

"I can only answer that question," replied Mr. Findlay, "by saying that I suppose there has been a uniform custom to order such things; and whether the custom be good or bad, the men who furnished the articles upon the order of an officer of the government had a perfect right to do so and are entitled to payment."

"The custom had better be broken up now," said Mr. Dingley.

"Then break it up some other way," retorted Mr. Findlay.

"The officer may be personally responsible," said Mr. Dingley; "but this is not an indebtedness which should be borne by the taxpayers." The amendment was adopted by a vote of 79 to 47.

Mr. Dingley's close application to public business sapped his vitality and brought on an illness early in May that alarmed his family and friends. On the 12th of the month while going to the house, he was overcome with an attack of vertigo or heart weakness that caused him to totter and fall on the sidewalk near the corner of 14th street and New York avenue. He was assisted to a neighboring drug store where restoratives quickly brought him to consciousness. Mr. Reed, his colleague, happened to appear on the scene, and was told of Mr. Dingley's illness. He quickly went to Mr. Dingley's side, and shortly afterwards assisted him to his room in the Hamilton house. The tender hands of a loving wife and daughter soon restored the sick man to his accustomed health; but it was five days before he again ventured to the house to participate in public business. The work involved in the conference over the shipping bill, still further drew upon his strength; and on the 8th of June in company with his wife and daughter, he started for his home in Maine for a few days of needed rest. Shortly before he left Washington he received information that he had been unanimously renominated for congress by the Republicans of the second congressional district. The convention was held at Auburn, Hon. J. P. Swasey presided, and presented Mr. Dingley's name. In referring to the only candidate before the convention, Mr. Swasey said: "He has filled with honor the gubernatorial chair; he has industriously and efficiently represented this district in congress. His fidelity is attested by the fact that while a convention is in session to nominate his successor he is attending to his duties in Washington." The resolutions said that: "In the person of Honorable Nelson Dingley Jr., we recognize an active and faithful exponent of those principles upon which the success of our government has depended, and that his untiring efforts in behalf of the business and commercial interests of not only his district and state

but of the whole country, entitle him to the support of all voters of this district."

Throughout this session of congress, a storm was gathering about the head of President Cleveland because of his wholesale vetoing of pension bills. On the 21st of June he sent 15 messages to congress, vetoing as many special pension bills which had passed both branches of congress. July 6th he sent to the house messages announcing his disapproval of twenty bills of a similar character; and three days following, the storm broke in the house with terrific fury. President Cleveland was severely arraigned for his course. Mr. Brumm of Pennsylvania characterized him as "the great obliterater of segregated ribs and the great representative of absolute power." After a heated debate lasting until nearly midnight, the veto messages were referred to the committee on invalid pensions.

One of the Democratic campaign statements made before the presidential election of 1884, was that the high war tariff had accumulated a large surplus in the treasury, thus depriving the people of needed money. With a view of appearing to carry out its pledge, the Democratic majority in the house, through the chairman of the ways and means committee, presented a resolution providing, "that whenever the surplus or balance in the treasury, including the amount held for redemption of the United States notes, shall exceed the sum of one hundred million dollars, it shall be, and is hereby made, the duty of the secretary of the treasury to apply such excess, in sums not less than ten millions per month, during the existence of any such surplus or excess, to the payment of the interest-bearing indebtedness of the United States payable at the option of the government." Mr. Morrison brought up the resolution in the house July 13th, and made a lengthy speech in explanation of its provisions. He made his resolution plausible by declaring that "the application of one hundred million which now lie unused and unproductive, to that part of our debt which is payable whenever we are able and willing to pay it, would put that much more money to its legitimate uses. It would tend to make money cheaper, increase the means of exchange, and help in the transaction of business. A hundred million of money is the capital which employs a hundred thousand men in productive industries; together they make two thousand million dollars worth of products, and add seventy millions to the annual wealth of the country. It would save us from three million dollars of annual interest and annual taxes which we are now paying. More than that, it will take

away something of the temptation which leads us here in congress to vote large appropriations and make improvident expenditures in which we pretend to justify ourselves because there is too much money in the treasury." The debate covered the whole range of federal finance, and party politics. On the next day, Mr. McKinley of Ohio, and Messrs. Reed and Dingley of Maine made notable speeches exposing the true inwardness of the resolution. They called it "a mere political game." Mr. Dingley said: "This is the first attempt in the history of this government to determine by legislative resolution what should be the working balance of the treasury," and added: "Today by virtue of the gold redemption fund, which has been maintained by the secretary of the treasury for more than seven years, every greenback dollar is as good as gold. But with this resolution a law, this redemption fund will begin to disappear."¹

This was really an attempt on the part of the Democratic leaders of the house to force the payment of the national debt in silver, and to force the government in its financial transactions, to a silver basis; but the resolution was agreed to by a vote of 207 to 67. Mr. Dingley voted "no." The resolution was amended in the senate so as to provide for a working balance of twenty millions, in addition to the greenback redemption fund, and also so as to authorize the president to suspend the operations in case of expediency. In this form it was adopted by both houses.

During the discussion of the fortifications appropriation bill, July 17, Mr. Dingley took occasion to remark that "economy is always essential but a wise economy is not parsimony. Adequate appropriations for any object of public concern is economy and not profligacy of expenditures; and the withholding of necessary appropriations is waste and may result in injury to the public interests. It seems to me that the withholding of appropriations to put the nation in a state of defense in case of war, which is sure to come to all nations, is anything but statesmanship. The great majority of the people are willing to support the proper employment of the public money in furthering whatever will advance the prosperity and strength of the nation." He then proceeded to show that the Democratic claim of economy was not well founded, "for there has been almost no reduction of expenditures for ordinary purposes or in directions under the control of the administration." This speech¹ was in reply to Mr. Springer of Illinois, who claimed that "the

¹—See Appendix.

Democrats had expended ~~several~~ million dollars in the last fiscal year less than the Republicans did the previous year."


Mr. Dingley in the third of August was excused from attending the sessions of the house during the remainder of the session, and left Washington for his summer home on the coast of Maine. Two days later the first session of the thirty-ninth congress adjourned. This was the first session of a congress under a Democratic administration for twenty-five years, and the country watched its course with interest if not with hope. The record brought universal disappointment. The session was more important in what it omitted to do than in what it actually did. The Democratic majority seemed to have no definite policy, hence the business of the session drifted. Mr. Dingley played a very important and influential part. Mr. Morrill asked Mr. Dingley how it was he had his own way in every committee meeting. "It seems to me you pretty much run things," he said.

"Oh, I guess not. I merely give my advice," replied Mr. Dingley.

His influence was great because of his tact and knowledge of human nature. He always kept out of unnecessary quarrels.

Mr. Dingley secured one week of rest before he plunged into the state campaign. The Republicans of Maine had nominated Joseph R. Bodwell for governor, and adopted resolutions endorsing the protective tariff and the course of the members of congress from Maine. He began his speaking August 11 at his home in Lewiston. The next day he spoke at Damariscotta with Senator Hale. Then followed many speeches at different points in the state. Several temperance addresses were interspersed, so that the month of August and the first two weeks of September found his time fully occupied. He always dreaded a stumping tour, and returned from this one in a state of physical collapse. His speeches however, were models, not in their oratory, but in their candor and conviction.

The state election was September 13, and the Republicans were victorious by 13,000 plurality. All four Republican candidates for congress were elected by large majorities. Mr. Dingley's plurality was 6,000 and his majority 3,000. The legislature was overwhelmingly Republican, insuring the re-election of Senator Hale. Mr. Dingley said: "If the result in Maine is an indication of the popular feeling in the country, as it usually is, then it is clear that the Republican party has not been in a better condition since 1874 than



GROVER CLEVELAND. W. L. WILSON.
J. D. RICHARDSON. J. C. S. BLACKBURN.

Democrats had expended sixteen million dollars in the last fiscal year less than the Republicans did the previous year."

Mr. Dingley on the third of August was excused from attending the sessions of the house during the remainder of the session, and left Washington for his summer home on the coast of Maine. Two days later the first session of the forty-ninth congress adjourned. This was the first session of a congress under a Democratic administration for twenty-five years, and the country watched its course with interest, if not with hope. The record brought universal disappointment. The session was more important in what it omitted to do than in what it actually did. The Democratic majority seemed to have no definite policy, hence the business of the session drifted. Mr. Dingley played a very important and influential part. Mr. Morrison asked Mr. Dingley how it was he had his own way in every committee meeting. "It seems to me you pretty much run things," he said.

"Oh, I guess not. I merely give my advice," replied Mr. Dingley.

His influence was great because of his tact and knowledge of human nature. He always kept out of unnecessary quarrels.

Mr. Dingley secured one week of rest before he plunged into the state campaign. The Republicans of Maine had nominated Joseph R. Bodwell for governor, and adopted resolutions endorsing the protective tariff and the course of the members of congress from Maine. He began his speaking August 11 at his home in Lewiston. The next day he spoke at Damariscotta with Senator Hale. Then followed many speeches at different points in the state. Several temperance addresses were interspersed, so that the month of August and the first two weeks of September found his time fully occupied. He always dreaded a stumping tour, and returned from this one in a state of physical collapse. His speeches however, were models, not in their oratory, but in their candor and conviction.

The state election was September 13, and the Republicans were victorious by 13,000 plurality. All four Republican candidates for congress were elected by large majorities. Mr. Dingley's plurality was 6,000 and his majority 3,000. The legislature was overwhelmingly Republican, insuring the re-election of Senator Hale. Mr. Dingley said: "If the result in Maine is an indication of the popular feeling in the country, as it usually is, then it is clear that the Republican party has not been in a better condition since 1874 than

now. The trial of Democratic rule in the country has evidently not been reassuring."

The Prohibitory party vote in this election was much smaller than anticipated, being only 3,607 votes. Mr. Dingley was a consistent Prohibitionist, and yet the third party Prohibitionists in his congressional district, nominated a candidate for congress against him. Mr. Dingley said that "the result of the Maine election for the third time emphasizes the fact that there is no dislodging prohibition from the people of Maine; that there is no party so loyal to legal suasion as the Republican; that the Prohibitionists of Maine cannot consent to sacrifice prohibition for the sake of founding a new party on one issue whose interests are well cared for by the party through which the slaves has been freed and through which has been won the great moral and legal reforms of the last quarter of a century."

The November elections reduced but did not overcome the Democratic majority in the national house of representatives. Sad havoc was made among the leading Democrats. Mr. Morrison, chairman of the ways and means committee was defeated; J. Randolph Tucker, chairman of the committee on judiciary, saw the storm coming and declined a renomination. Mr. Hurd, the free trade leader was overwhelmingly defeated. The only Democrat of ability and leadership qualities (aside from Speaker Carlisle who escaped defeat by only a narrow margin) who weathered the storm was Mr. Randall, whose tariff views made him in bad odor in the Democratic ranks. The continued decline of the Democratic majority was significant. President Cleveland's administration had not met with popular favor.

Mr. Dingley secured much needed rest in the month of November. He devoted his time to editorial writing and attention to private business. During the month he made only one address and that at Bath on "American Shipping" on the evening of November 20th. On the third of December, he left his home for Washington, tarrying in Boston on the following day to deliver an address¹ on "The Fisheries Question" before the Middlesex club. On this occasion he was given a royal reception as one of New England's most distinguished sons.

The second session of the forty-ninth congress assembled at noon December 6th. The president's message contained no new practical suggestions. His position on the fisheries question was criticised. He dodged the vital question of the commercial privi-

1—See Appendix.

leges of American vessels in Canadian ports and addressed himself to the fishery rights of American vessels in Canadian waters. Mr. Dingley said "that the president ought to have interviewed some of the hardy fishermen of Maine before trying to make ancient history a modern issue."

Mr. Morrison was determined to again force consideration of the tariff bill at once and to prevent the passage or consideration of Mr. Hewitt's administrative part of it, as a separate measure. The protective tariff Democrats, led by Mr. Randall, held a conference, and voted to oppose the Morrison bill. Mr. Dingley said that "the bill should not be taken up. Mr. Morrison drew his bill, and then went around the house bargaining and amending it so as to get as many Democrats as possible to support it. Such a patched-up measure does not deserve consideration. It is much better to wait until the next session. The surplus has not piled up yet so as to be anything dreadful." On the 19th of December the house by a vote of 154 to 140 refused to consider the bill. All but five Republicans voted "no," and 26 Democrats voted "yes." The announcement of the second defeat of the bill awoke great applause on the Republican side. This ended all chance of tariff legislation at this session. Mr. Morrison was angry over his defeat and made many threats. The hopeless division in the Democratic ranks was again manifest.

Soon after the assembling of congress, President Cleveland sent to the senate the correspondence between the state department and Minister Phelps of London, regarding the fisheries trouble. The correspondence stated that demands had been made upon Great Britain for remuneration for losses incurred by American fishermen not only from seizures of their vessels and damages resulting therefrom, but also for the denial of commercial rights which rightfully belonged to them. It also recommended the establishment of a commission to collect proof of such losses incurred. "These letters," said Mr. Dingley, "show that our side has been very ably presented. Mr. Bayard's statement of the issue is good, but not equal to Mr. Phelps' presentation which I regard as absolutely perfect in terms and spirit. The complaint can be justly made that the department here did not act with due promptness and spirit; but nothing can be said against the manner in which Mr. Phelps attended to the matter when it was laid before him. But he was not given the case until four months after the hostile proclamation by the Canadian minister of marine. Too much time was wasted over the British legation in Washington. I wanted our

government to act in March immediately upon receipt of the Canadian proclamation, and perhaps if the case had been turned over to Mr. Phelps then, a settlement could have been arranged before the Dominion had committed itself so far as to seize our vessels. The president, I regret to say, does not show in his annual message that he has any appreciation of the dispute. When he refers to it as relating to 'fishery rights' and the 'territorial waters' and 'in shore fisheries,' he falls into the extremely unfortunate error that our opponents have all along sought to advance. The correspondence has nothing whatever to do with fish, but is wisely confined to our commercial rights in Canadian ports. We do not want to fish within the three mile limit, and of all the seizures that have been made, only one, I believe, was on the pretext that this regulation had been violated. If this vessel really disregarded the limit, no defence will be made by our people or our government."

Late in January a bill passed the senate authorizing and directing the president not only to exclude Canadian fishing vessels from our ports, but also to deny admission into this country of Canadian fish, in case the Canadians continued to deny commercial privileges in their ports to our fishing vessels. It even went further and in such event authorized exclusion of all Canadian vessels and Canadian produce if the president should consider it proper to do so, although the purpose was to only exclude Canadian fishing vessels and Canadian fish. January 26th, this bill was referred to the house committee on foreign affairs, and later a substitute was reported. The substitute went further than the senate bill, by authorizing the president to stop communication by rail with Canada. The house bill also described "vessels owned wholly or partially by British subjects" as subjects for exclusion, overlooking the fact that the ownership of the vessel does not determine her nationality. Mr. Dingley was opposed to this substitute bill,¹ and addressed the house at some length, reviewing the whole situation and pointing out his objections. The bill was finally passed but not until after Mr. Dingley's amendment had been accepted providing "that any foreign vessel found fishing within the three mile limit of the coast of the United States shall be liable to seizure and forfeiture, and any persons employed thereon liable to a fine of fifty dollars for each offense." This amendment was a portion of Mr. Dingley's bill introduced in the house February 7 and reported unanimously February 11 by the committee on shipping.

1—See Appendix.

The committee on shipping, February 11, voted unanimously to report three bills introduced by Mr. Dingley—one relating to ships' papers, a second relating to the abolition of ship fees, and a third relating to vessel fisheries of the United States. These bills were reported to the house the following day. None were reached, however, during the session.

Congress adjourned from December 22nd to January 4th for the holidays; and two days before adjournment Mr. Dingley introduced a resolution instructing the committee on naval affairs to inquire into the expediency of authorizing the secretary of the navy in the construction of vessels for the navy hereafter, to invite proposals for the building of a part of such vessels on such special terms as will best secure the end sought, by responsible citizens or companies who will undertake to establish new iron and steel ship building establishments at desirable points on our Atlantic, Pacific and Gulf coasts, and to provide for these establishments such suitable plants as will make them available for the building of iron and steel vessels for the navy as well as the merchant marine. The Washington Post the following day said editorially: "Come, Mr. Dingley; don't play the veiled prophet of Khorassen or the silent sphynx of Sagadahoc. Tell us what you mean by your mysterious resolution about the navy."

Mr. Dingley left Washington for Maine December 21st. Here he spent the holiday recess in the bosom of his family. With his devoted wife and his five children he partook of a Christmas reunion dinner. "It was a happy season," he recorded in his diary. And how dear to him was his family! He returned to Washington with his wife and daughter January 1st, 1887. On the evening of January 18 he spoke at the shipping league dinner and also at the Dartmouth alumni dinner.

The afternoon of February 22nd was assigned for consideration of resolutions relative to Austin F. Pike, a senator from New Hampshire, who died on the 8th of October previous to the assembling of congress. On this occasion Mr. Dingley delivered a brief but impressive eulogy.¹

The appropriation bills were rushed through the house; and at noon on the 4th of March, the 49th congress expired. Mr. Dingley left for his home the day before congress adjourned. On the 10th of the month he accepted an invitation to address a merchants' club dinner in Boston, on the fisheries question. His address¹ was received with great favor; and he was extended unusual courtesies as

1—See Appendix.

the ablest representative in congress of New England's great fishing industry. March 15 he visited Mr. Blaine at the latter's residence in Augusta and took tea with him.

Mr. Dingley devoted a large share of his time during this spring and summer, writing editorials for the Lewiston Journal and watching with deep interest its remarkable growth. In the Journal of April 7 appeared a long article from his pen, giving his personal recollections of the progress of his paper since 1854 when he first took up the editorial pen. He recalled the month of September, 1857, when he became "not only sole proprietor and editor, but also foreman, book-keeper and reporter, and worked from 12 to 14 hours every day."

The grand lodge of Good Templars held its session in Lewiston, late in April, and Mr. Dingley made an address. He said that it was twenty-one years since he was elected grand chief of the order in Maine, and no position that he had occupied since, had given him more genuine satisfaction than that. He spoke of the prominence that Maine held in the Temperance interests of the world, and said that a drunkard in Europe, on the continent or in England, was the same as in this country. He spoke of the receptions tendered him at one time in Europe as a representative of the temperance work of the state of Maine, congratulated the order on its position in Maine and its name and renown abroad, and ended with a prophecy, "that the grog shops must go." Mr. Dingley was elected a delegate to the national grand lodge which met at Saratoga, May 15. Here he made an address of some length. On the 23rd of June he attended commencement exercises at Bowdoin college and made a short address at the commencement dinner.

The temperance forces of Maine held a grand Fourth of July celebration at Canton. Neal Dow, Sidney Perham, Governor Bodwell and Mr. Dingley made addresses. Mr. Dingley was introduced as "one of the men who has done valient service with pen and voice for the cause of prohibition and temperance." Mr. Dingley was received with applause, and spoke of the importance of making faithful use of those moral and educational agencies which form temperance habits in the young; maintaining a healthy temperance sentiment, and securing the enactment and enforcement of good laws.

Mr. Dingley's life at his summer home on the coast of Maine was all his fond heart desired. Surrounded by his children and grandchildren, so dear to him, he surrendered mind and body to rest and recreation. From the broad piazza of his cottage, swept

by the cool sea breezes, he viewed the beauties of an ideal summer home and watched with deep interest the doings of an ideal summer colony. Twice a day he walked leisurely to the little postoffice near the steamer landing to get the mail. After meals he regularly put on his soft felt hat, buttoned his coat about his chest and walked briskly to the shore. Evenings always found him playing some game in the family circle or reading a newspaper. He invariably joined in the laughter and jokes. His gentle nature was a benediction to his household; and in the twilight, his great heart and brain were lulled to rest by the sound of his beloved daughter's voice—a voice that was sweet and tender. Sunday evenings he invariably attended praise service at the little chapel, offering some simple testimony of his love of Christ. To this island community he was something more than human; and all showed him a respect and honor that was beautiful. The purity of his life, the sincerity of his nature, and the generosity of his soul, made his life here well nigh perfect. Thus passed the summer.

During September, October and November Mr. Dingley devoted much time to editorial work. The columns of the Lewiston Journal fairly bristled with his strong and pointed articles on important public matters. In commenting on Speaker Carlisle's proposed plan for the reduction of the revenue Mr. Dingley wrote: "He proposes to abolish the internal tax on tobacco, amounting to about twenty-eight million dollars annually—a reduction which would have been made at the last session of congress if the speaker had not refused to allow it to come before the house. He does not now propose to allow a bill for the abolition of the tobacco tax to come before the house simply, but coupled with a measure to reduce the duties on imports." Mr. Dingley pointed out that Mr. Carlisle's plan of admitting "food products" and "raw materials" free, simply meant "the giving up to Canadians the benefit of our market."

Late in October Sir Charles Tupper was appointed Canada's representative on the British membership of the fisheries commission which was soon to meet in Washington. The other British members were Minister West, and Mr. Chamberlain. The American members were Messrs. Bayard, Putnam and Angell. Mr. Dingley wrote: "The fishermen of this country will be entirely content with the commission. What they have feared has been that the commission would go outside of the disputed question relating to the fisheries, that is, the line of the three mile limit, and the rights of American fishing vessels in Canadian

ports, and negotiate as to the free admission of Canadian fish, etc., in our ports. We have entire confidence that Messrs. Putnam and Angell, who are associated with Secretary Bayard, will not advise any departure from questions relating to the three mile limit and the rights of fishing vessels."

On October 21st Mr. Dingley addressed the New England branch of the national shipping and industrial league in Boston.¹ The Portland Argus, in commenting on this, said that Mr. Dingley confessed "the tariff had done more to drive our ships from the ocean than any other cause." Mr. Dingley wrote in reply: "After Congressman Dingley has argued repeatedly in and out of congress that the changes from the tariff of 1846 and 1857 to the tariffs of 1861, 1872 and 1883 have had nothing to do with the decline of our shipping in the foreign trade, and after he presented that argument at the shipping convention in Boston, with such success that even Judge Woodbury, Colonel Spofford and other prominent Democrats admitted that it was beyond successful dispute, it is certainly surprising to have the Argus now assert that Congressman Dingley confesses what he has already denied."

The result of the November elections was on the whole favorable to the Republicans and full of encouragement to Republican hopes for the future. Mr. Dingley observed that: "Every state that was Republican two years ago still maintains its proud position." November 10 he attended a meeting of the Republican state committee at Augusta and made a short address. At this meeting nothing was said about Maine's presidential candidate in 1888, beyond a passing allusion to the general expectation of the Republicans of the country that Mr. Blaine was desired as their standard bearer, and that the decision practically rested with him as to whether he would head the ticket.

On the 20th of November Mr. Dingley left for Washington, reaching there in time to take part in the opening session of the house.

1—See Appendix.

CHAPTER XVI

1887-1889.

The first session of the fiftieth congress assembled on the eve of an important presidential election. The events of the succeeding six months were to shape the policies of the contending parties, and to bring before the people the great issues of the campaign. There were 168 Democrats, 153 Republicans and 4 Independents in the house, and the whole country awaited with deep interest the debates and votes on the tariff, and the proceedings on other important matters. President Cleveland's message called attention to what he called "a congested national treasury and a depleted monetary condition in the business of the country," and added that "our present tariff laws—vicious, inequitable and illogical source of taxation, ought to be at once revised and amended." The president however said that "it is not proposed to entirely relieve the country of taxation. It must be extensively continued as the source of the government's income; and in a readjustment of our tariff the interests of American labor engaged in manufacture should be carefully considered, as well as the preservation of our manufacturers. It may be called protection, or by any other name, but relief from the hardships and dangers of our present tariff laws, should be devised with a special precaution against imperiling the existence of our manufacturing interests." This declaration did not suit the free traders; but the slight disapprobation was appeased by his appeal for "free raw materials"—a popular and catchy phrase. The president gained no little distinction by the use of epigrams which were subsequently freely quoted in the campaign. The most familiar phrase was his declaration that a dwelling upon the theories of pro-

tection and free trade savored too much of "bandying epithets; it is a condition which confronts us—not a theory."¹ Thus the country was notified that an assault would be made on the protective tariff; and this was made still more emphatic by the re-election of Speaker Carlisle, a radical free trader. Mr. Reed of Maine was the Republican candidate for speaker. Congress met on the 5th of December and the battle began.

Mr. Blaine was traveling in Europe at this time, searching for health and recreation; and when in Paris read the message of President Cleveland. He immediately gave out a brilliant interview in which he exposed the fallacies of the president's message and gave his own plans for reducing the revenue. This interview attracted even more attention than the president's message, and caused a shout of joy to go up all over the country. Mr. Blaine probably did not intend it as such, but it straightway made him a formidable candidate for president.

President Cleveland and his free trade associates used the fact that all parties desired to reduce the revenue about seventy million dollars annually, to force a reduction of duties on articles which could be produced in this country to the extent of our wants. Mr. Dingley said that "the only way to reduce the revenues, so far as imports of articles similar to those which we can produce in this country are concerned, is either to make the duty high enough so as to very nearly hold our markets for our own industries and labor, or else to put these articles on the free list or at rates approaching nothing. The former method would build up our industries, the latter method would destroy them."

In the fiftieth congress were—Joseph Wheeler, Hilary A. Herbert and William C. Oates of Alabama; Joseph McKenna and W. W. Morrow of California; Charles A. Russell of Connecticut; Charles F. Crisp and James H. Blount of Georgia; William E. Mason, A. J. Hopkins, Robert R. Hitt, Lewis E. Payson, William M. Springer and Joseph G. Cannon of Illinois; William S. Holman, William D. Bynum, George W. Steele and Benjamin F. Shrively of Indiana; David B. Henderson and James B. Weaver of Iowa; John G. Carlisle, William C. P. Breckenridge and J. B. McCreary of Kentucky; Thomas B. Reed, Nelson Dingley Jr., Seth L. Milliken and Charles A. Boutelle of Maine; John D. Long, Henry Cabot Lodge

¹—President Cleveland was famous for employing strange and epigrammatical phrases and unusual words in his messages. In his famous message of March 1, 1886, relative to his power to suspend certain officials during the recess of the senate, he said: "And so it happens that after an existence of nearly twenty years of almost innocuous desuetude, these laws are brought forth." The words "innocuous desuetude" were quoted freely in the campaign.

and Charles H. Allen of Massachusetts; J. C. Burrows, James O'Donnell, Mark S. Brewer and Byron M. Cutcheon of Michigan; John M. Allen and T. C. Catchings of Mississippi; Richard P. Bland of Missouri; William Walter Phelps of New Jersey; S. S. Cox, A. J. Cummings and William B. Cockran of New York; Benjamin Butterworth, James E. Campbell, Charles H. Grosvenor, and William McKinley Jr., of Ohio; S. J. Randall, Henry J. Bingham, John Dalzell and William L. Scott of Pennsylvania; James D. Richardson of Tennessee; Roger Q. Mills and J. D. Sayers of Texas; William L. Wilson of West Virginia—all distinguished as public men and subsequently occupying high positions of trust.

The house met at noon on the 5th of December. When the drawing of seats was reached Mr. Dingley asked unanimous consent that Mr. Cox be allowed to select his seat in advance, owing to his long service. The request was granted unanimously. On the same day Mr. Dingley offered amendments to the rules creating a standing "committee on merchant marine and fisheries." This new committee was created, and has been of inestimable benefit to the shipping interests of the country. On the 21st of December, Mr. Dingley returned to his home in Maine, and on the following day congress adjourned for the holidays.

About the middle of December it was announced that the fisheries commission had been unable to agree; and an adjournment was had until January 4th, 1888. This failure to agree was on account of the uncompromising attitude of Canada. The Washington correspondent of the Boston Journal interviewed Mr. Dingley at some length on this matter. The latter said: "It should be remembered that the refusal of Canada to allow American fishing vessels to enter her harbors for the ordinary commercial purposes which every other civilized nation freely accords to the vessels of foreign countries, has been for the purpose of driving the United States to admit Canadian fish and other products into the markets of this country, free of duty. Our commissioners say, first that our fishermen do not desire to fish in Canadian waters, although they do ask to have the three mile limit clearly defined; second, that commercial privileges in Canadian ports for our fishing vessels are not to be bought, but are due us in turn for the same privileges to Canadian vessels of all kinds in our ports, and are freely conceded by all commercial nations since maritime reciprocity became the rule of civilization; and third, that the question of reciprocal trade relations with Canada is a distinct one from the fisheries question, and ought not to be complicated with them. When the fishery

complications are settled, we shall be in a better frame of mind to approach the reciprocal trade question." Mr. Dingley called attention to the fact that the United States and Great Britain had adopted maritime reciprocity since the treaty of 1818, and the renunciation of that treaty does not affect the rights of American vessels to enter Canadian ports to ship fish in bond. He added: "The Canadian representative argued very much as Shylock did in regard to his pound of flesh, and I told him so. And I added 'if you claim that you must have your pound of flesh, according to what you insist is the bond, you cannot complain if the United States insists that you cannot take any blood with it. Or in other words you can not find fault if we go back also to the condition of things in 1818 and refuse to allow Canadian fishing vessels to enter our ports, and refuse to allow you to land goods in our ports to be shipped in bond to Canada.' The Canadian representative took exceptions to this, and protested that it would be unjustifiable retaliation. He urged that so long as Canada had near-by ports as a base of supplies for the best fishing grounds in the world, she was entitled to hold this advantage for her vessels, to which I replied that these fishing grounds belonged to the world, and Canada had no more right to attempt to usurp them by denying vessels of the United States the use of her ports, for the landing and shipment of fish in bond to this country and purchase of supplies, than the United States had to attempt to increase the markets for her own products in Canada by denying to Canadians the privilege of using our ports to land goods, for shipment in bond to Canada."

On the 28th of December Mr. Dingley left his home for Washington, remaining in Boston long enough to make an address that evening at the Merchants' association banquet on the fisheries question.¹

Mr. Dingley's prominence in the fisheries controversy prompted many friends of the fishing industry to urge Speaker Carlisle to place him on the committee on foreign affairs, anticipating foreign complications over the question; but the speaker could not or did not heed the request and Mr. Dingley was given his former committee places—"merchant marine and fisheries" and "banking and currency."

Immediately upon the reassembling of the house Mr. Dingley introduced petitions of the grand lodge of Good Templars of Maine for a commission of inquiry into the liquor traffic, and for an

1—See Appendix.

amendment of the constitution of the United States prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor. He also introduced several bills of importance relating to shipping and currency matters. June 3rd he visited the treasury department and laid before Secretary Fairchild some facts relative to the effect of the order for the reduction in the force in the custom service. He showed that the strict enforcement of the recent order would result in the closing of many custom houses in Maine. The treasury authorities, therefore, decided to suspend final action in the matter and send a special commissioner to Maine to examine into the situation and report as to the advisability of a modification of the order.

Mr. Dingley was now what the Washington Post said, "one of the best informed men in public life on the subject of American shipping interests." The American Shipping league was in session in Washington, and Mr. Dingley was requested to act as a delegate. In speaking of the work of the league he said that "the convention will probably approve the same line of policy adopted some five years ago by France with wonderful success—providing that every American vessel, sail or steam, which trades with foreign ports, shall be allowed thirty cents per ton for each thousand miles sailed or steamed for a period of twenty years. England subsidizes only mail-carrying lines; but she pays heavily for this service, and at the same time holds these lines ready for a naval reserve. We are liable at any time in case of a foreign war, in which England is involved, to see the Cunarders and other swift trans-Atlantic steamships withdrawn with scarcely a word of warning from our ports, and our foreign commerce seriously crippled at a blow."

Mr. Dingley's attention early in the session, was called to alleged discriminations on the Welland canal against vessels and cargoes bound for American lake ports, in violation of the treaty of 1871. He promptly introduced a resolution calling upon the president for all information. The resolution asking the secretary of the treasury instead of the president for the information, was adopted by the house. ¹ Mr. Dingley made a brief speech pointing out the

1—In the New York Tribune of May 14, 1888, Joseph Nimmo Jr., published an article on "The relations between Canada and the United States," in which he said: "A flagrant and most absurd violation of a treaty stipulation between the United States and Great Britain was brought to the attention of the house of representatives on the fourth of January, 1888, in the form of a resolution submitted by the Hon. Nelson Dingley Jr., of Maine, a gentleman always vigilant of the maritime and commercial interests of the United States. During the last three years, through the device of an 'order in council,' a rebate of eighteen cents per ton has been allowed out of the total toll of twenty cents per ton on grain of all sorts passing through the Welland and St. Lawrence canals, if shipped to Montreal. The long and short of this is a premium of eighteen cents a ton offered by the Canadian government in favor of the diversion of American commerce from American seaports and American transportation lines. An off-

admission of the discriminations by the Canadian government. On the 25th of January the secretary of the treasury sent to the house an extract from the report of the commissioner of navigation, giving evidence of a constant violation of treaty obligations by Canada. The Dominion government denied the charge and in dispatches to the Boston Herald, sarcastically called upon Mr. Dingley to study the 27th article of the Washington treaty. The latter replied: "I doubt not that the president will promptly call the attention of the British government to this infraction of treaty obligation; and if the discrimination is continued at the opening of navigation in the spring, will inform congress, in order that such discrimination against the United States may receive proper attention."

The fisheries negotiators reassembled in January but maintained a discreet silence. The sessions of the commission were less and less frequent until they met only twice a week with sessions only an hour long. Mr. Dingley said: "I have no means of information as to what is actually going on, but I am inclined to think the English members of the commission are purposely delaying its deliberations. The demand which England has always made for Canada has been that, in consideration of opening her ports to American vessels, Canada should be able to send her lumber and fish into this country free of duty. I feel confident that the fisheries negotiators are simply delaying matters with a view to ascertaining what congress intends to do with the tariff bill which will soon be under discussion. If it is decided to put lumber and fish on the free list neither Canada nor England will place anything further in the way of a speedy settlement of existing difficulties." On the 25th of January Mr. Dingley dined at the Arlington hotel, as the guest of Mr. Putnam, one of the American commissioners. It was, however, more and more evident that the commission would adjourn without settling the matter. It had been in session two months with nothing to show for it. President Angell and Mr. Putnam were reported to be prejudiced in favor of the administration's policy of granting free fish to the Canadians; but their investigations convinced them that such a policy was neither called for nor admissible. They advised Secretary Bayard that the United States ought not to make any of the concessions asked for by Canada. However, on the 15th of February, the commissioners reached an

cer of the revenue department of Canada has innocently confessed that 'the object of the Dominion government in promulgating this order is to encourage trade over the St. Lawrence route instead of allowing it to go to American ports.' This, however, as explained by Mr. Dingley on the floor of the house of representatives, is an open violation of Article XXVII of the treaty of Washington."

agreement in the shape of a treaty with sixteen articles and a protocol, which were presented to the senate. The publication of the text of the treaty created consternation. It was an abject surrender of the United States. Mr. Dingley said: "It certainly cannot get the necessary two-thirds vote. Why, look at it. To understand what we have failed to get, it will be better to recall what the contention has been. The American fishermen from the beginning, and the secretary of state in his correspondence with Great Britain insisted upon three things, first, the right to enter Canadian ports for the purchase of bait, any kind of provisions and supplies that might be needed for fishing; second, the right to ship the men and to do anything and everything that was necessary for preparing to fish; third, the right to trans-ship fish when caught, and to send them in bond to the United States. This was, if anything, more important than any other claim. All of these things the secretary of state in the correspondence, insisted should be ours. As to the other things which were sought, there is not much difficulty about them. They conceded we had the right to enter their harbors for repairs and shelter, and in certain exigencies, on the way home, upon telegraphing to Ottawa, permission was given to obtain provisions to go home. But they denied the main things which our fishermen insisted were theirs of right. With this controversy going on, these negotiations opened. What is the result? We can go into Canadian ports for shelter and for repairs, and for provisions on the way home. That is to say, we have exactly the same rights or privileges that we had before. These rights, to be sure, are set forth a little more clearly, but that is all. Everything else is to be purchased in some way. The Canadians have conceded to us just what they were willing to concede before the conference met and nothing more. But the real gist of the treaty is in what will be called the 'snapper.' The 'snapper' of the treaty is this: that whenever we put upon the free list all kinds of prepared fish, we shall have things for which we have contended, the right to trans-ship fish in bond, the right to buy bait, etc. But these things must be purchased by our free list. Meanwhile we are to live by the *modus vivendi*. And what is the *modus vivendi*? That any fishing vessel of the United States that will pay a dollar and a half a ton for license shall have a right to purchase provisions and supplies and bait and may ship fish in bond. That is to say, a three hundred tons fishing vessel, and that is about the average size of the fishing vessels, may pay a license of \$450 and obtain these rights. This is the most abject surrender of the main points for which the Ameri-

can fishermen have contended. How much better off are we? It will be answered that we can go into Canadian ports for shelter and repairs. True; but we can remain there only twenty-four hours. We are certainly no better off than we were before, and we have surrendered all of the important points for which we have contended. I do not make much of the provision as to the delimitation of the three mile limit. That is secondary. There is no real controversy over that point. It has been many years since the Canadians have really insisted upon the head line theory. None of the vessels that have been seized were seized upon that ground. But, even in this respect, we have made a surrender. Bays are now to be closed to us which were partly opened before. It does not matter that a bay is thirty miles wide, near the shore end; if it is ten miles at the mouth is a closed sea for us. I cannot for a moment think that this treaty can be ratified."

The controversy was not over the three mile limit or the manner in which the four privileges mentioned by the treaty of 1818 should be exercised, but it was over the question of commercial privileges outside of these. The Canadians contested that we had no right to any privileges outside of these four, and especially that we had no right to buy provisions and supplies for a fishing voyage, to purchase bait and trans-ship fish. The United States commissioners contended that we had a right to exercise these privileges. Our claims to these privileges were pressed at the start, and at last surrendered, with the simple concession by Canada that an American fishing vessel on its way home might buy in a Canadian port sufficient provisions to last it to the home port, and that such a vessel which had been disabled might land and sell and trans-ship its catch of fish—concessions which a savage could not refuse. The result was not a compromise but a surrender. Fortunately the treaty was rejected. After a protracted debate in the senate a vote was taken August 21st on a resolution of ratification requiring a two-thirds vote. The resolution was rejected by a vote of 27 to 30. Every Republican senator present voted for rejection. Mr. Dingley said that "the rejected treaty surrendered the very privileges which Secretary Bayard demanded as the right of our fishing vessels in his correspondence with the British government between May 1886 and July 1887. It is surprising that a single senator was found to vote to ratify such a surrender."

President Cleveland was so disconcerted by the rejection of the treaty that he straightway sent a message to congress asking for an amendment to the so-called retaliatory act of 1887, so as to give

him the power to stop all transit of bonded Canadian goods through our territory (which would have involved a similar denial of transit for American goods through Canadian territory) in case Canada continued to deny commercial privileges to our fishing vessels in her ports. Mr. Dingley said that this message was "a most remarkable document considering that the president has refused for a year and a half the ample power given him by the act of 1887, and especially considering his efforts for six months past to force the ratification of a treaty admitting that these vessels have no commercial rights in Canadian ports and providing that we can obtain them only by free fish or the purchase of a license. It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the president's object is not to secure the rights of our fishermen, but to divert attention from the treaty which surrendered these rights." This message received a storm of indignant protests and contributed to the large Republican majority in Maine.

On the 27th of February the congressional temperance society celebrated its 55th anniversary. Mr. Dingley, who had been elected president the year before, presided and made an address. He spoke of the encouraging outlook for temperance, not only in Maine but all over the country.

Mr. Dingley's bill authorizing the secretary of the treasury to issue fractional silver certificates of the denominations of twenty-five, fifteen and ten cents, passed the house March 19 under a suspension of the rules. Mr. Dingley spoke briefly in explanation of the bill. Its passage by a large majority was somewhat of a surprise, because it was opposed by the quiet influence of the secretary of the treasury who did not want the trouble of the new issue, and by such Democratic leaders as Randall, Cox, Bacon and Bland, who spoke against it. The brunt of the fight for the bill was borne by Mr. Dingley, aided by Mr. Phelps of New Jersey and Mr. Dargan of South Carolina. The argument presented by Mr. Dingley was that "there is a large and increasing demand for a currency of fractional parts of a dollar for transmission through the mail. Seed men, publishers, farmers, etc., find it necessary to largely use the mails and this form of currency will be a great convenience to them."

The bill to exempt coastwise sailing vessels, when piloted by their own master licensed as a pilot, or when towed by a steam vessel in charge of a United States pilot, from the obligation to pay state pilots whose services are not employed, was reported adversely from the committee on marine and fisheries. The minority

report prepared by Mr. Dingley declared that "congress thirty-six years ago, exempted coastwise vessels, piloted by their own licensed master or mate from the obligation to pay state pilots not used. Twenty-eight states have also exempted coastwise sailing vessels from paying fees to state pilots not used, and this bill would simply place American sailing vessels on the same basis as steam vessels." But the lobby of the pilotage association defeated the bill this session precisely as it did in the last session.

Mr. Dingley's keen sense of fairness and justice was again manifested when on the 21st of March a bill came before the house providing for the payment of a full days' wages for each eight hours of work performed by laborers employed by the government since June 25, 1868, the day when congress enacted the eight hour law. In supporting this bill Mr. Dingley said that "whenever any laborer, workman or mechanic employed by or on behalf of the government has not been paid in accordance with the terms of the eight hour law, he should be. It has been the proud boast of our government that it has observed in letter and spirit all its engagements to those who took our bonds and other obligations in the dark hour of the civil war. We should deal with equal fidelity towards the laborers, workmen and mechanics employed by or on behalf of the government."

The most memorable fight of the session occurred early in April. It was over the direct tax refunding bill. It will be remembered that soon after the breaking out of the rebellion in 1861, congress levied a direct tax of twenty million dollars to carry on the war for the preservation of the union. The loyal states all assumed the amount assessed against them and paid their share of the tax in full—less the fifteen per cent allowed any state for assuming and collecting it. The returned rebel states were not called upon to pay their proportion of the tax. When the bill, which had already passed the senate, reached the house the Democrats opposed it, taking the ground that if there was to be any refunding, the cotton tax imposed during the war ought also to be refunded. The friends of the bill replied that what was just twenty-five years ago is just now; and that the fact that the disloyal states obtained a practical rebate of their proportion of the tax over twenty-five years ago by not paying it, only strengthened the claim of the loyal states who paid the tax to have their rebate now. The Democrats resorted to filibustering for nine days; and on the 12th of April, the deadlock was broken by the adjournment of the house, the Democrats voting solidly for adjournment.

A resolution authorizing the secretary of the treasury to apply the surplus money in the treasury to the purchase or redemption of United States bonds caused considerable debate in the house. In supporting the resolution Mr. Dingley said that "this is simply a declaratory resolution to the effect that the provision incorporated in the appropriation act of 1881 to which it refers, was intended to be and is a permanent and continuing authority to the secretary of the treasury to use up the surplus funds in the treasury for the purpose of purchasing the public debt." He favored the resolution because "under existing circumstances the business of this country demands that there shall be such action taken as would lead to the use of that provision in the act of 1881 in employing the hundred millions of surplus that is today in the treasury in reducing the public debt, and to set afloat for the use of the business interests of the country that hundred millions which the condition of business so much demands. * * * We all know, as a matter of fact, that for six months, yes for eight months, past, there has been accumulating in the treasury of the United States money which the business interests of the country demands and needs for circulation, and which, in my judgment, months ago the president ought to have used in purchasing the debt of the country and thus releasing that money to the use of the business public." The president had doubts respecting his power under the act of 1881, but Mr. Dingley thought there was no necessity for such doubt. The resolution was passed by more than a two-thirds vote.

The Democratic majority in the house felt compelled to make an effort to enact a "tariff reform" bill; therefore, on the 2nd of April, Chairman Mills reported from the ways and means committee a bill "to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue." Mr. McKinley of Ohio, the leader of the minority on the committee, submitted the views of the Republicans. This bill was President Cleveland's platform, modified slightly by the demands of the southern members, especially from Louisiana, who wanted a higher duty on sugar. The bill as reported to the house, placed wool, manufactured lumber, lime, wood and chemical pulps, potatoes and other farm products on the free list, and reduced the duty on all woolen and cotton goods and other manufactured products. The bill was a severe blow to northern farmers, and northern interests in general; and the publication of its provisions caused wide-spread alarm. Debate on the bill began April 17. Chairman Mills opened it with a lengthy speech in support of the measure. He was enthusiastically ap-

plauded by his Democratic sympathizers. Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania followed in reply, and was likewise applauded by his Republican followers. The tariff debate was resumed April 24, when Mr. McMillin of Tennessee made an elaborate speech in favor of the bill. He declared that protection had destroyed American shipping, whereupon Mr. Dingley challenged the statement and reminded Mr. McMillin and the house that American commerce declined between 1855 and 1861, prior to the adoption of the protection. Then turning to Mr. Dingley, the gentleman from Tennessee said: "Do you favor that policy which permits the United States to seize and confiscate the ship bought by the citizens of the United States in a foreign port, if it comes into our own ports, but at the same time protects him if he goes somewhere else, and sails under the flag of some other country?" Applause from the Democrats followed this query. Mr. Dingley promptly replied: "I favor the policy of confining American registered vessels to vessels built in this country—a policy which was inaugurated by Washington, and has continued in operation from that day until the present." This retort was greeted with loud applause from the Republicans. Mr. McMillin then tried to force Mr. Dingley into admitting that the tariff had made materials entering into the construction of ships higher than before the war. But Mr. Dingley refused to be forced into such a corner, and demanded the right to answer such a question so as to bring out the real facts. He parried Mr. McMillin successfully amid the laughter and applause of the house. On the 3rd of May he spoke at great length on the tariff bill¹ following Mr. Wilson of West Virginia. This speech was considered one of the ablest delivered during this entire debate in favor of protection. It exhausted the entire subject, exposed the fallacies of the free-traders, proved the falseness of the claim that a tariff is a tax to the extent of the duty; and showed that the true test of price is labor. He discussed "free raw materials," the "foreign market delusion" and the "value of our home markets." He pointed out that "there is no basis for the oft-repeated assertion that the protective tariffs of the United States since 1861 have restricted the export trade of the United States. By common consent the United States is pointed to everywhere as the most marvelous growth recorded in history." The foreign carrying trade, the value of protection to farmers, and the object lessons in free trade, were topics elabor-

1—See Appendix

ated in this able speech. He concluded with this eloquent sentence: "It ought to be sufficient to deter us from hazardous experiments, which look attractive in the figures of rhetoric, that under the protective policy which has prevailed for more than a quarter of a century, the United States has grown so wonderfully in population, agriculture, manufacture, and all the elements which have to do with material prosperity, that even the most distinguished and most highly honored statesman of Great Britain—the peerless Gladstone—has spoken of her in debate in parliament as the most marvelous and prosperous nation in christendom." This speech was received with prolonged applause—in fact Mr. Dingley received an ovation. It was pronounced the greatest tariff speech of the session, and was used by the Republican national committee as a campaign document, and was circulated in every state in the union. It added to his already splendid reputation as a tariff expert. It made him, next to his colleague, Mr. Reed, the foremost Republican in the house. Already he was marked as a coming leader.

On the 24th of May when the postoffice appropriation bill was under consideration, Mr. Dingley called the attention of the house to the small compensation paid American steamships for carrying the mails. In reply to Mr. Blount of Georgia, Mr. Dingley said: "I say to my friend from Georgia, that unless this government shall do at least as much for the American steamship lines as Great Britain, as Germany, as France, as Italy, and as other foreign governments are doing for theirs, that the day is not far distant when the American steamship lines shall have been driven from the ocean." In this same debate Mr. Dockery of Missouri, said that "it is conceded by both sides of the house that the gentleman from Maine is particularly well informed on all matters relating to our merchant marine, and is usually extremely fair in debate."

In the meantime, debate on the Mills tariff bill dragged wearily along. As the first paragraphs of this bill placed imported Canadian manufactured lumber on the free list, the bill received a most vigorous onslaught from the members from Maine. Mr. Dingley's attacks on the bill were persistent and unanswerable. May 31st and June 1st he replied specifically ¹ to Mr. Outhwaite of Ohio, in which he pointed out the consequences of putting lumber on the free list. He called the attention of the house to the careless way in which the census figures were used in debate. Thus again the Democratic members of the house learned to have a wholesome re-

1—See Appendix.

spect for Mr. Dingley's familiarity with statistics. On the 6th of June he offered an amendment to the lumber schedule which opened up the fisheries question. The amendment provided "that all said articles shall be subject to the same duty as now provided by law when imported from any country which denies in its ports, to fishing or other vessels of the United States authorized to touch and trade at foreign ports, the same commercial privileges, including the right to buy provisions, bait and supplies, and to trans-ship any portion of cargo, as are granted to similar vessels of such country in the ports of the United States." Mr. Dingley spoke at some length on this amendment.¹ He presented an argument on the protection of American fishermen that has been pronounced the ablest ever offered on that question. This speech showed the unpatriotic and inconsistent course of Secretary Bayard and contained proof of the betrayal of American interests. He closed with this splendid peroration: "But it is said with a sneer that this government does not propose to go to war for a few New England fishermen. Mr. Chairman, the heroic deeds of the fishermen of the United States, the fishermen of New England if you please, as recorded in the history of the republic, ought to awaken in the halls of congress as well as in every patriotic breast, a determination to stand by their interests. It was the fishermen of New England who in large part officered and manned the armed vessels which sailed under John Paul Jones and bore so gallant and conspicuous a part in our war for independence. It was the fishermen of New England who contributed a generous quota to the gallant crews of the naval vessels which won such conspicuous laurels in the war of 1812. It was from the fishermen of New England that the nation drew liberally to man our blockading fleet in the late civil war. Surely such men as these are deserving not only of the protection but of the gratitude of the republic."

The effect of Mr. Dingley's amendment was to bring out the fact that the Democratic leaders were anxious to put imported fish on the free list. The Democratic members of the ways and means committee conferred hastily on the floor and put forward Mr. Breckinridge of Kentucky, to offer an amendment providing that "all kinds of Canadian fish be put on the free list when Canada should extend commercial privileges to American shipping vessels." A lively debate followed in which the conduct of the Canadians in denying to American fishing vessels privileges freely accorded to similar Canadian vessels in our ports, was shown up in its

1—See Appendix.

true color. A division was had, and every Democrat except Randall and two others voted for the free fish amendment. This practically destroyed Mr. Dingley's amendment, so the Republicans voted solidly against the whole proposition. But Mr. Dingley accomplished what he desired by calling public attention to the facts, first, that Canada was denying rights and privileges already belonging to our fishermen in order to compel this government to permit the free admission of Canadian fish; second, that the administration was trying to accomplish this very thing, through the treaty at this time before the senate. In the language of Mr. Butterworth of Ohio, Mr. Dingley proposed simply to say to the Canadians: "If you want to bring into the United States your lumber free of duty, you shall at least bestow upon the fishermen of this country the right to go into your harbors, the right they have hitherto enjoyed, at least in practical experience, for more than half a century. We will not concede that we have been wrong in insisting upon this right, and pay you for the privilege of enjoying that which is already our own, though you interfere temporarily with its enjoyment by our fishermen."

June 11 was the thirty-first anniversary of Mr. Dingley's marriage and on that day he recorded in his diary these simple but touching words: "What a happy thirty-one years!" Five days later he was at his home in Lewiston, surrounded once more by his entire family. "A very pleasant reunion," he wrote.

While at home he followed eagerly the proceedings of the Republican national convention at Chicago. Notwithstanding the publication of a second letter from Mr. Blaine, unqualifiedly withdrawing his name from the list of presidential candidates, his name was freely used prior to the convention. Mr. Blaine's letter was to Whitelaw Reid, editor of the New York Tribune, and was dated Paris, May 17. Mr. Blaine referred to "a single phrase of my letter of January 25th from Florence" which "has been treated by many of my most valued friends as not absolutely conclusive in ultimate and possible contingencies." He added: "If I should now, by speech or by silence, by commission or omission, permit my name in any event to come before the convention, I should incur the reproach of being uncandid with those who have been candid with me. I speak, therefore, because I am not willing to remain in a doubtful attitude." This almost pathetic letter was made the more so by this sentence: "The misrepresentations of malice have no weight, but the just displeasure of friends I could not patiently endure."

Fourteen candidates received votes on the first ballot. Mr. Blaine received 33 votes. On the fourth and fifth ballots, Mr. Harrison of Indiana developed great strength. Mr. Blaine still had 48 votes, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Boutelle of Maine read two dispatches from Mr. Blaine asking his friends to "respect his Paris letter," and adding: "I think I have a right to ask my friends to respect my wishes." Benjamin Harrison was nominated on the 8th ballot, and Levi P. Morton was nominated for vice president. Mr. Dingley had said early in February relative to Mr. Blaine's declination to run for president: "His decision will not be changed no matter what is done in the convention. He has carefully reviewed the situation, and having taken this step through motives of patriotism, will adhere to it."

Mr. Dingley was in his seat again in the house of representatives June 26, and in the succeeding session took part in the debate on the tariff bill. He spoke of the injustice of placing manufactured bricks on the free list, and allowing bituminous coal to remain on the dutiable list, since "more than one third of the cost of bricks is in the coal used to burn them." He called attention to the fact that the Democratic platform recently adopted had declared that "it did not propose to place a single article produced by the labor of this country in such a condition that it would not protect the difference in the cost of labor as between the production of the same article here and in foreign countries; and yet," he added, "here is a proposition to put manufactured brick upon the free list where the labor cost of every thousand brick manufactured is at least a dollar more per thousand than it costs in the adjoining British provinces." June 29, he fought for a duty of fifteen cents per cask on lime. The bill as reported, provided for a duty of ten cents per cask. Mr. Dingley's main point in his speech was that "it ought to be evident to the committee that unless the duty on imported Canadian lime is made sufficient to cover the difference in the cost of labor employed in Canada and in the United States, the lime manufacturing industries in this country will be gradually driven to the wall by Canadian competition, or our labor will be compelled to accept Canadian wages."

June 30th, Mr. Dingley cleverly exposed the insincerity of the Democrats who pretended to be waging war against trusts. In the course of the discussion of the Mills bill the item regulating the tariff on bi-chromate of potash and bi-chromate of soda was reached. The Mills bill reduced the duty from 3 cents to 2 1-2 cents per pound. The two bi-chromates were used extensively in

the dying of woolen and cotton goods. The chromate mines which produced the ore from which the potash and soda were manufactured, were controlled by a trust—"an absolute monopoly"—Mr. Dingley said. He moved to strike out 2 1-2 cents and insert 1 cent. So strong was Mr. Dingley's argument and so convincing his figures that on a viva voce vote his motion was carried. As soon as it had been declared carried, there was a scurrying among the Democrats; tellers were demanded and Mr. Dingley's motion defeated by a narrow margin.

July 3rd he spoke several times during the tariff discussion. He challenged the production of any statistics to show that wages were no higher in this country than abroad. "I am assured, Mr. Chairman," he said, "that wherever comparisons are made in any industry in this country, it will be found that labor receives, for effective results accomplished, at least 50 per cent more than the same labor receives in Great Britain; and when protective duties are removed from all our industries, we must either give them up or reduce the wages of our labor to the foreign standard." The debate on this day was most interesting. Mr. Rogers of Arkansas, and Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania, assaulted the protective tariff and ridiculed the position of the Republicans. Mr. Dingley replied to these gentlemen at some length,¹ pointing out that a tariff on goods produced in this country to the extent of our wants is not a tax which increases the burdens on the consumer; and calling further attention to the fact that "the Mills bill comes in to discourage domestic industry and to encourage importations."

The weather in Washington during this protracted debate was excessively warm, and the physical strain upon members of congress was great. The two days occupied by the house in the discussion of the sugar schedule in the Mills bill, served to place in a striking light the sectional and unjustifiable attitude of the majority party on the tariff. Mr. Dingley moved to amend the bill by cutting down the duty on sugar one half. He said the prevailing specific duty on raw sugar was the enormous figure of 82 per cent, and the Mills bill proposed to keep it at the high and unjustifiable figure of 68 per cent. His proposition was to reduce the duty to 41 per cent, which would be the same protection given to other industries considered from the protection point, and at the same time a reduction of a tax on an article of food used in every family—"as so little sugar is made in this country that home competition does not fix the price, but every cent of duty is added to the price." Mr.

1—See Appendix.

Dingley's speech¹ in support of his amendment surprised and worried the majority who saw its purport but who rallied enough votes to defeat it. July 10 Mr. Dingley moved to amend the tariff bill so as to make the duties on cotton goods specific instead of ad valorem. The amendment was however defeated. When the wool schedule was reached he entered his protest against the free admission of wool. In a speech¹ of great force he pointed out the inconsistency of the Democratic contention that free wool would raise the price of wool to the farmers and lower the price to consumers. July 16 he offered an amendment permitting the free admission in bond of materials used in the construction of iron vessels for foreign trade. His speech¹ was effective, but the amendment was rejected.

Mr. Springer of Illinois, made an elaborate speech in favor of the tariff bill. As it finally appeared in the record, it bristled with figures, tables, statistics and applause. Mr. Dingley replied to Mr. Springer without special preparation. The debate¹ which followed between Messrs. Springer and Dingley was lively in the extreme. Several Democrats came to the rescue of the member from Illinois, but Mr. Dingley conquered them all. This contest gave the latter a rare opportunity to display his ability and power in debate, and his wide and accurate knowledge of the tariff question.

Saturday, July 21st, the Mills tariff bill passed the house amid great applause on the Democratic side. The Republicans contented themselves by replying: "Wait until November." Mr. Dingley's summing up¹ of the Mills bill was used liberally in the next election as a campaign document.

July 13, when the postoffice appropriation bill was under consideration Mr. Dingley spoke¹ at some length in favor of fair mail compensation to American steamships carrying the mail to foreign countries.

The excitement attending the tariff debate was over and Mr. Dingley sought rest. He still remained in Washington but attended the sessions of the house only a short time each day. He spoke but twice and then briefly, the remainder of the session. On the 3rd of August he spoke¹ on the French spoilation claims and on the 18th of August he spoke¹ briefly in reply to Mr. Bynum of Indiana, who in the course of the debate on the Chinese treaty bill said it was the policy of the Republican party to open the doors of the country to import cheap labor and to close them to cheap food and clothing. This charge Mr. Dingley indignantly denied.

1—See Appendix.

Mr. Dingley was renominated for congress April 27 by acclamation. Cheers were given for the nominee and the resolutions declared that "the convention cordially commends to the voters of this district the nomination of Honorable Nelson Dingley Jr., and with pride points to his past faithful and distinguished services in office and pledge to him our earnest support." The campaign in Maine was already under way, and on the 22nd of August Mr. Dingley returned to Maine for a few days rest at his island home.

Mr. Blaine returned from his foreign trip August 17. He was received with enthusiastic and loving regard by thousands of his fellow citizens in New York City; while his journey from the metropolis to his home in Augusta, Maine, was a series of ovations. Every city and town in Maine sent an urgent request to the Republican state committee for Mr. Blaine; and the first great meeting he addressed was at Lewiston on the evening of August 25th. Mr. Dingley was the first speaker at this mass meeting and received an enthusiastic welcome, the large audience breaking into applause that was taken up again and again.

Mr. Dingley labored until election day on the stump and in the editorial chair. He discussed the tariff and the fisheries question with marked ability. His influence was felt not only in Maine but all over the east. The position of the Democratic party on the tariff was assailed vigorously. His familiarity with the subject gave great weight to his utterances. His statements were unchallenged, his logic was unanswerable. It was a hard fought battle in every county of the state; and when the votes were counted, it was found that the Republicans had carried the state by nearly 19,000 plurality. Mr. Dingley's majority over all other candidates in the second district was 4,000. It was a crushing defeat for free trade. Mr. Dingley said of this important election: "The result shows that the Democratic leaders were greatly mistaken in their estimate of the effect of the Mills bill and the fishery treaty on the voters of Maine. The tariff and the fishery question have been thoroughly discussed by both Republican and Democratic speakers and papers, and the voters of Maine clearly appreciated the questions at issue. When it is borne in mind that Maine is a type of other northern states, and that the tendencies of public opinion are usually the same here as elsewhere, the significance of the election cannot be misunderstood. The result in Maine shows that the people of the north are rising against the Democratic policy as indicated by the Mills bill, the fishery treaty and other acts of commission and omission by the majority of the house."

Congress was still in session and Mr. Dingley resumed his seat in the house September 14. Three days later he introduced a resolution calling on the president for information as to whether the rights of American fishermen had been violated by the Canadian authorities during the past year, and if so, whether he had retaliated as he had authority to do under the act of March 3rd, 1877. Mr. Dingley said: "I shall be curious to see President Cleveland's answer." The resolution practically said to President Cleveland: "Inasmuch as you have informed the house that you want more power to secure the rights of our fishermen in Canadian ports, now denied, and inasmuch as you say that your treaty of last February would have secured all these rights if it had been ratified; please inform the house first, whether Canada denies any of the rights secured by your treaty (which she does not); secondly, whether you now hold that our fishing vessels are entitled to enter the Canadian ports to buy bait, etc., and land fish, and if so whether Canada has denied these rights, and whether you have taken any steps to enforce existing laws that give you ample authority to withdraw from Canada, which she denies to us; and if you have not enforced these laws whether because you think we are not entitled to such privileges or for any other reason, why do you ask congress to give you more power?"

The result of the election in Maine was an object lesson to the Democratic party. It was also a severe blow to the doctrine of free trade as exemplified in the Mills bill. But in order to bring out in still clearer contrast the position of the Republican party on the tariff, the Republican majority in the senate reported a bill early in October. This bill like the Mills bill, proposed to revise the tariff and reduce the revenue; but it preserved the protection principles. It was, Mr. Dingley said, "designed to restrict the importation of articles which can be produced here to the extent of our wants, and to hold our own markets for our own industries and our own labor by removing as far as possible the competition of the products of the cheaper labor of Europe, and thus taking away a factor which would compel us to give up making such articles, or else to reduce our wages to the British standard." The house and senate tariff bills thus brought the issue between free trade and protection squarely before the people.

On the 29th of September Mr. Dingley in company with Senator Hawley of Connecticut addressed an immense Republican rally at the Academy of Music, Philadelphia. The Press said that the meeting was never but once equaled, and added that "cheers long

and loud fairly shook the immense Academy when Mr. Dingley was introduced. It was an ovation seldom accorded to any man." He accepted the greeting as a recognition of the importance of the great victory which had recently been achieved by the Republicans of Maine. He said it foreshadowed the election of the Republican national ticket. His discussion of the tariff was pronounced able and exhaustive. On the 7th of October he started for Woodstock, Virginia, where he was to make a political address. He stopped that night at Harper's Ferry, and early in the morning rode through Shenandoah Valley, made historic by Sheridan's battle, and reached Woodstock early on the morning of October 8th. He stopped with Senator Riddleberger, the famous Virginian; and that afternoon addressed a large audience, three-fourths former confederates. Mr. Dingley wrote thus of his experiences: "The meeting was announced to commence at one in the afternoon, and I was to make the opening and principal speech to be followed by local speakers. When on my way to the place of meeting I was informed that Col. O'Ferrall, the Democratic candidate for congress and several leading county Democrats were on hand and proposed to hold a Democratic meeting in opposition to the Republican meeting unless they were allowed half the time set apart for speaking at the Republican meeting. This struck me as rather an impudent proceeding. I was informed however, that this was the course pursued throughout the state; and that in many cases to avoid trouble the Republicans had allowed the Democratic speakers to come into their meetings and occupy half the time (although the Democrats never reciprocated) and that on several occasions where a division of the time had been refused by Republican speakers the meetings had been disturbed and even broken up by rowdies. The Republican committee this day declined the proposition of the Democrats. The Republican meeting at once commenced. The audience was unusually large for such a community, mostly confederates.

"I have addressed many northern audiences but I never found one which appeared to listen more intelligently and more sympathetically. The applause was frequent and on several occasions came very near the yell which makes the southerner.

"The Democrats organized another meeting so near that the voices of the speakers and the shouts of the audience could be heard. The speakers principally defended the confederate cause and derided the idea of a Yankee coming down to Virginia to speak

of political duties." Mr. Dingley returned to Washington by way of Strasburg and Manassas.

October 9 when the deficiency appropriation bill was being considered in the house Mr. Dingley spoke on public expenditures. He called attention to the fact that in 1884 the Democrats charged that the Republican party and the Republican administration had largely and unnecessarily increased the appropriations and the number of officials. He pointed out that these charges were utterly without foundation. The points made in the brief debate were unanswerable.

October 10 he visited the battlefield of Gettysburg and in the evening addressed a political meeting.

The first session of the fiftieth congress closed October 21. It was ten and a half months long, the longest in the history of the country. The only session that ever approached it in length was in 1850, the year of the great slavery debate resulting in the so-called compromise measure, when congress did not adjourn until September 30. Yet notwithstanding the unprecedented length of the session, very little of special public importance was accomplished. The whole session in the house was given up to the tariff fight which was precipitated by President Cleveland in his free trade message. The session was memorable, however, for the crusade inaugurated by President Cleveland and the Democratic majority against the system of protection of American industries and labor under which the country had prospered for twenty-seven years. The Mills bill passed the house and went to the senate where the Republican majority formulated a substitute which reduced the revenue but preserved the system of protection.

In reviewing Mr. Dingley's work in this session of congress, it is not too much to say that he was the best informed member of the house on the tariff. His colleagues conceded this. He was modest and unassuming; generous and forbearing; fair and candid in debate; just to all. He added to his already wide reputation as an industrious and conscientious member of congress.

October 16, five days before congress adjourned, Mr. Dingley started for his home in Maine, making a brief stop at New York, New Haven, Conn., and Pawtucket, R. I. At the latter place he addressed a political meeting. October 19 he was once more at his home fireside—a spot so precious to him.

But his rest was not of long duration, for five days after he reached home he plunged into the national campaign. He addressed political meetings nearly every day and wrote editorials

for the Lewiston Journal. October 29 he spoke at a banquet given by the Portland club.

Interest in the presidential election was intense. Mr. Dingley sat up all night Tuesday, November 6, and personally supervised the election returns for the Journal. At two o'clock in the morning it was quite clear that Harrison and Morton had been elected; and at four o'clock an extra edition of the Journal was published announcing the glad news to the people in Mr. Dingley's home. He wrote of the result: "It is admitted by the most observing Democrats that the president's message and the Mills bill have turned into a Republican triumph what in all probability would have been a Democratic victory if they had not capitulated to the southern free traders. All honor to the Republican hosts who have fought so splendid and successful a battle in the face of so great obstacles. For every electoral vote the Republicans have given Harrison and Morton they had to fight in an open field; while the Democracy have had 147 southern electoral votes assured to them from the start. Altogether it has been the severest contest in which the Republicans have ever engaged and the grand victory does all the more honor to the Republicans who have taken hold of the work so zealously and faithfully."

The Republicans in this election secured control of the national house of representatives, and retained control of the senate. The real significance of the election was the rejection of the revenue policy as embodied in the Mills bill which passed the house of representatives. The country emphatically declared for a protective policy; and it was a matter of speculation what the Democratic leaders would do in the approaching short session of congress. Mr. Dingley outlined the probable Republican policy as follows: First, tariff revision along protective lines; second, admission of Dakota, Washington and Montana; third, liberal pension laws; fourth, improvement of public school system; fifth, restoration of our merchant marine; sixth, a new navy; seventh, a sound financial policy; eighth, a new American spirit in our foreign policy. "In short," he wrote, "under Republican auspices we expect to see the narrow and un-American Bourbonism buried, and the broad progressive and truly American spirit which controls the Republican party come in and take its place, building up a new and progressive south, which will frown down the cruel methods that have there kept Bourbonism in the saddle, developing the spirit of enterprise and starting the wheels of business in all parts of the country."

From election day to December 1, Mr. Dingley divided his time between editorial work, political addresses and rest in his family circle. On the 27th of November he attended a banquet in Portland in honor of Governor-elect Burleigh. In his address he spoke of the prediction he had made at the last meeting of the club prior to the election, and although his prophecy was based largely on the statements of others, and was almost too sanguine for his own belief, yet it had more than come true; New York and Indiana had been carried and West Virginia had been most thoroughly shaken up. The victory was achieved under the most discouraging auspices, and it could not have been achieved had not the cause been so grand, so glorious, and had not every Republican from one end of the country to the other come up and done his duty. "Nothing afforded me," he continued, "greater satisfaction than to notice after the victory that when our friends in Philadelphia proposed to give the chairman of the Republican national committee a reception, he modestly declined saying that it was not a victory of the national committee or of any leaders but it was a victory of every member of the Republican party. I believe, my friends, that this is a victory not simply for today, not simply for four years, but that it is a victory which if wisely used, will be followed by a succession of Republican triumphs in the years before us." Later on he said: "And if my friend and colleague at my right (Mr. Reed) shall be as I believe he is to be, speaker of the next house of representatives, I believe that he and his Republican associates will apply themselves as my friend Capt. Boutelle has said, to some remedy for this southern evil."

His honored father was seventy-nine years old November 15 and the day was celebrated by a family gathering. Thanksgiving day this year was not filled with the joys of former years; for only one of Mr. Dingley's children was at home. Saturday following Thanksgiving day he started alone for Washington, reaching there Sunday morning. Once more he sat before the open fire in his Washington home, the Hamilton house. That first Sunday evening was very lonesome for this gentle and generous man whose joy and happiness was never complete when dear ones were absent. Public business never crowded from his mind thoughts of wife and children.

The second and last session of the fiftieth congress met December 3rd and the members listened to the reading of President Cleveland's message. Of this message Mr. Dingley said: "Mr. Cleveland goes down with his flag flying. His message is a declaration

that he has nothing to take back. He glories in the sentiment he has previously expressed. This is all very well. Everybody respects a man who sticks to his sincerely entertained opinions. But the president goes farther and gives expression to certain bitter and inflammatory sentiments." This message was an appeal for "the relief of those of our countrymen who suffer under present conditions," and contained this dark observation: "When to the selfishness of the beneficiaries of unjust discrimination is added the discontent of those who suffer, we shall realize that the benefits of our government are endangered. Communism is a hateful thing and a menace to peace and organized government, but the communism of combined wealth and capital, the outgrowth of overweening cupidity and selfishness which insidiously undermines the justice of free institutions, is not less dangerous than the communism of oppressed poverty which, exasperated by injustice and discontent, attacks with wild disorder the citadel of rule."

Mr. Dingley signalized the opening of the session by attempting to secure the passage of a bill for the erection of a monument to Gen. Henry Knox at Thomaston; but the Democrats filibustered, broke a quorum and defeated the bill. December 7 he spoke briefly in favor of a bill granting a charter to the Maritime Canal company of Nicaragua.¹ He urged upon the house the importance of constructing the canal, "not simply that we may have a short route for trade with the east and with the western coast of South Africa, but because such a canal gives to our vessels in the coastwise trade an important advantage." He appealed to the house not to kill the bill by attaching unnecessary amendments. The conference report on this bill was adopted by the house February 6 by a vote of 178 to 60. Mr. Dingley again spoke¹ in favor of granting the charter.

Mr. Dingley was accompanied during the first few weeks of this session by his only daughter who was attending school in Washington. He loved devotedly this "sole daughter of his home," and recorded at this time in his diary many beautiful and touching sentiments of her whom he tenderly adored. December 16 was his daughter's birthday and he recorded in his diary: "It hardly seems possible that this young lady nearly as tall as I am is our little daughter who so short a time ago was a baby springing towards me as I entered the house. She is a great joy to us." December 20 he attended the marriage of his second son and the following day was once more at home with his devoted wife. Christmas day was unusually happy to this indulgent father who found no sacrifice too great for those most dear to him.

¹—See Appendix.

The second week of the new year found him again in Washington with his wife and daughter occupying his familiar and home-like rooms in the Hamilton house.

Little business was done by the house during January; and on the last day of the month Mr. Dingley accepted an invitation to address the Boston chamber of commerce on "American Shipping in Foreign Trade."

An incident occurred in the house February 6 showing Mr. Dingley's close observation of events and his shrewdness in making a point for his side of the case. He sent to the clerk's desk a resolution from the committee on merchant marine and fisheries asking the secretary of the treasury "to inform the house what orders were given to the commander of the United States revenue cutter Richard Rush, in reference to the protection of the seal fisheries in Behring Sea in the spring and summer of 1888." He asked unanimous consent to insert "in lieu of debate" some of the evidence taken by the committee. Mr. Breckinridge of Kentucky objected, whereupon Mr. Dingley had read to the house the evidence of Capt. Sheppard of the revenue cutter Richard Rush showing that he had secret orders directing him not to seize illegal sealers in Behring Sea. This created a sensation in the house to the discomfiture of the Democrats who felt that this was another evidence of the incapacity of the state department.

February 15th, Mr. Dingley's fifty-seventh birthday, he wrote in his diary: "It hardly seems possible I can be so old. I feel as young as I ever did."

This session of congress was notable from the fact that it enacted the laws whereby four new states—North Dakota, South Dakota, Washington and Montana were admitted into the union.

February 18th a bill to provide for the better protection of the fur seal and salmon fisheries of Alaska came up for consideration in the house and Mr. Dingley in a speech¹ criticised the state department for neglecting to protect the Alaska seal fisheries.

The remainder of the last session of the fiftieth congress was uneventful. The senate tariff bill died in the house; the Democratic factions were divided on the minor revenue bills, and the Democratic congress adjourned with no reform tariff legislation to its credit. Mr. Dingley, troubled with a serious bronchial affection, was considerably indisposed and was obliged to refrain from taking part in public business. Sunday night, February 24th, the coldest of the year, he presided at the annual meeting of the Congrega-

1—See Appendix.

tional Temperance society at the Garfield memorial church. At the close of the meeting he was elected president.

Public interest was now absorbed in the incoming Republican administration. President Harrison arrived in Washington February 26 and at once began the serious and important work of completing his cabinet. Mr. Blaine had already been invited to accept the portfolio of state and had accepted. Mr. Dingley indignantly denied a story that Mr. Reed was opposed to Mr. Blaine as secretary of state and that Mr. Blaine was opposed to Mr. Reed as speaker. "Mr. Blaine and Mr. Reed," he said in an interview, "are friends and the attempt to represent them as antagonistic to each other is silly and groundless. There is no foundation for the story that Mr. Blaine has not been tendered the position of secretary of state. The first gentleman to whom a place in the cabinet was tendered, was Secretary Blaine; and the tender was made to him in most flattering terms, as soon as Gen. Harrison was chosen by the electors."

The storm of March 4 disappointed thousands who attended the inauguration of President Harrison. Mr. Dingley ventured to the capitol to witness the closing scenes of the fiftieth congress and the inauguration ceremonies; but returned immediately to his rooms. The following day President Harrison's cabinet was confirmed and the Republican administration was launched.

For a month Mr. Dingley was overwhelmed with office seekers. He called on the members of the new cabinet; presented to Secretary Windom the name of T. R. Simonton for commissioner of navigation; conferred with the secretary relative to the protection of seals; and on the first day of April started for his home in Maine, stopping on his way at New York and New Haven. Seven days later he recorded in his diary: "It seems good to get home again." April 15 he spoke at Lynn, Massachusetts, in favor of a constitutional prohibitory amendment; and on the two following days spoke at Lowell and Fall River.

The proposed prohibitory amendment to the constitution of Massachusetts was defeated. Mr. Dingley observed that "the moral effect will be to strengthen the demands of the liquor interest for looser legislation and looser enforcement of existing laws. But this interest should remember that 'the mills of God grind slowly yet they grind exceeding small.' The citizens of the union who are getting their eyes open to the fearful dangers of the dram-shop, are daily increasing in numbers, and the time is not far distant when the

policy of every state towards it will be one of extermination rather than protection."

April and May were months of comparative rest for Mr. Dingley. The only official cares he had were over postoffices—and every member of congress knows that these cares are not light. The last of May he visited his son in Michigan returning early in June. The 11th of this month was the thirty-second anniversary of his marriage to his devoted wife. "Thirty-two happy years!" were the tender words he recorded in his diary. June 13 he attended the 150th anniversary of the incorporation of the city of Brunswick, and made an address at the dinner. On the 27th of the month he delivered an address at the Bates college commencement dinner.

The month of July brought to him many anxious days. His beloved daughter was taken dangerously ill and for many days hovered between life and death. With his devoted wife he watched day and night anxiously at the bedside of his only daughter and silently prayed for her recovery. No language can describe, no pen can picture, the silent and tearless grief of this devoted father watching for the faintest signs of hope. Those prayers were answered and his daughter was restored to health and strength.

The latter part of August President Harrison made a trip through Maine stopping at the principal cities. Mr. Dingley joined the presidential party at Bath where a reception was given. In an interview given the Boston Herald he predicted an extra session of congress and declared the existing circumstances demanded such extra session. "The narrowness of the Republican majority," he said, "the importance of the subjects to be considered and the evident disposition of the Democratic leaders to open the campaign now for the next presidential election, and to contest every Republican measure inch by inch, will inevitably make the approaching session of congress unusually important and exciting."

The 22nd of August, 1889, was the 100th anniversary of the incorporation of the village of Durham, Maine, Mr. Dingley's birthplace. The story of the founding of this place, the history of Mr. Dingley's ancestors and the birth of the town's most distinguished son is told elsewhere. The centennial day was ushered in by a salute of thirteen guns in honor of the original states. Five thousand people were assembled in the big tent when Mr. Dingley, accompanied by his venerable father, reached the scene of festivities. What sweet memories must have come to both father and son as they rounded the bend of the river and beheld once more the reminders of their joys and sorrows, their struggles and triumphs!

The house where the distinguished son was born recalled the dear face of his sainted mother; the faces of old settlers, still alive; carried him back to the days of childhood and youth; and as he faced the large and sympathetic audience his heart was filled with joy and thanksgiving. His address¹ was tender and eloquent—full of sweet memories of the past and large hopes for the future.

September 23rd he received news of the birth of his first grandchild, "which," he wrote in his diary, "caused something of a sensation in our family." He started for Washington by way of the west saw his first grandchild, attended and spoke at a banquet of the Sons of Maine at Chicago and reached Washington November 28, prepared for the arduous duties of another session of congress

1—See Appendix.

XVII.

1889-1891.

The fifty-first congress assembled with a Republican majority in both branches. The membership of the house was very much the same as in the fiftieth congress. Most of the veterans including Herbert, Oates, and Wheeler of Alabama; Crisp and Blount of Georgia; Hopkins, Hitt, Springer and Cannon of Illinois; Holman, of Indiana; Gear, Henderson, Lacey and Dolliver of Iowa; Carlisle of Kentucky; Reed, Dingley, Milliken and Boutelle of Maine; Lodge of Massachusetts; O'Donnell and Burrows of Michigan; Butterworth, Grosvenor and Taylor of Ohio; Kelley, Bingham and Dalzell of Pennsylvania; McMillin and Richardson of Tennessee; Mills and Sayers of Texas; and Wilson of West Virginia, had been returned.

At noon November 30th the Republican caucus met and nominated Mr. Reed for Speaker on the second ballot. The other candidates were McKinley, Cannon, Henderson and Burrows. Mr. Dingley was very active in Mr. Reed's behalf, and the result caused the Maine men to rejoice.

Congress assembled at noon December 2nd and at once elected Mr. Reed speaker. The vote was—Reed 166, Carlisle 154, Cummings 1. The result was greeted with applause. Speaker Reed's brief address to the house was characteristic and somewhat prophetic of his course during his career as presiding officer. He said: "Under our system of government as it has developed, the responsibilities and duties of this office are both political and parliamentary. So far as the duties are political, I sincerely hope they may be performed with a proper sense of what is due to the people


of this whole country. So far as they are parliamentary, I hope with equal sincerity that they may be performed with a proper sense of what is due to both sides of this chamber."

The president's message was received with great favor. He recommended a revision of the tariff laws along the lines of protection. He also said: "Earnest attention should be given by congress to a consideration of the question how far the restraint of combinations of capital commonly known as trusts is a matter of federal jurisdiction. When organized as they often are to crush out all healthy competition and to monopolize the production and sale of any article of commerce and general necessities, they are dangerous conspiracies against the public good, and should be made the subject of prohibitory and even penal legislation."


Speaker Reed was more prompt in appointing important committees than was his predecessor, Mr. Carlisle. December 10, he appointed the committees on election, ways and means, appropriation, manufactures and mileage. The Republican membership of the most important of these committees (ways and means) was as follows: Messrs. McKinley, Burrows, Bayne, Dingley, McKenna, Payne, La Follette, Gear. The Republican membership of the ways and means committee in the fiftieth congress was—Kelley, Brown of Indiana, Reed, McKinley and Burrows. Mr. Kelley was too old to serve and asked to be relieved. Mr. Brown of Indiana preferred a chairmanship and Mr. Reed was speaker. Consequently in accordance with precedent Mr. McKinley of Ohio was made chairman. It was through this chairmanship that the name of McKinley first became a household word. It was the tariff bill subsequently framed by this committee that materially assisted in making Mr. McKinley president of the United States.

The new members of this important committee were—Messrs. Bayne, Dingley, McKenna, Payne, LaFollette and Gear. Mr. Dingley's appointment to this committee was a fitting recognition of his services in the fiftieth congress. He was also retained on the committee on merchant marine and fisheries.

The committee on ways and means decided on prompt action in regard to tariff legislation; and on the 13th of December organized by the election of Mr. McKinley as chairman. The chairman appointed sub-committees, Mr. Dingley being placed on the sub-committees "On the public debt" and "On relief bills and claims." The committee met daily and arranged for hearings during the holiday recess. Thus was begun the long and laborious work of framing the McKinley tariff bill. The administrative bill "to simplify the



WILLIAM McKINLEY. CHAS. H. GROSVENOR.
J. B. HENDERSON. J. G. CANNON.



laws in relation to the collection of the revenues" was prepared early by the committee, and on the 25th of January passed the house.

The Democratic minority in the house had already decided upon a course of obstruction. They did not intend to do any business or to permit the Republicans to do any. Accordingly when, on the 29th of January the contested election case of Smith vs. Jackson was called up, the Democrats declined to vote on the question of consideration. Mr. Crisp raised the point of "no quorum," whereupon the speaker "directed the clerk to record the following members present and refusing to vote." This was the signal of a burst of applause from the Republicans and jeers from the Democrats. The clerk proceeded to read the names of the Democrats whom the speaker had noted as being present and not voting. When the name of Mr. Breckinridge was reached that gentleman stepped into the aisle and in a loud voice said: "I deny the power of the speaker and denounce it as revolutionary." Cheer after cheer went up from the Democratic side and it was several minutes before order could be restored. The clerk proceeded with the names, several members protesting vigorously. Mr. McCreary of Kentucky shouted: "I deny your right, Mr. Speaker, to count me as present, and I desire to read from the parliamentary law on that subject." The speaker calmly replied: "The chair is making a statement of fact that the gentleman from Kentucky is present. Does he deny it?" This characteristic and pointed reply provoked long laughter and applause on the Republican side.

When order was finally restored the speaker made a statement declaring that there was a provision in the constitution which declared that the house might establish rules for compelling the attendance of members. "If members can be present," he said, "and refuse to exercise their function, to wit, not be counted as a quorum, that provision would seem to be entirely nugatory. Inasmuch as the constitution only provides for their attendance, that attendance is enough. If more were needed, the constitution would have provided for more." The speaker insisted that all members present be counted. The house adjourned that evening in a high state of excitement, both sides preparing to renew the battle on the next day. Hardly had the chaplain finished his prayer and the clerk the reading of the journal, when the fight began. The Democrats refused to vote on the question of approving the journal of the day previous. The speaker said: "The roll call discloses the fact that 160 members have voted in the affirmative, and one in the negative,

which, in addition to the gentlemen present and declining to vote, constitutes a quorum." The applause on the Republican side was deafening. Mr. Springer appealed from the decision of the chair, but the speaker declined to entertain the appeal. The house was in an uproar, cheers, laughter and hisses following in quick succession. Mr. Springer insisted upon his right to be heard on the point of order that no quorum had voted, but the speaker refused to recognize him. "The gentleman from Illinois will take his seat," shouted the speaker. "The gentleman from Illinois will take his seat or not as he chooses," roared Mr. Springer. "There are no rules under which I can be called to take my seat, and I can stand up here if I desire." Thus the battle waged all that afternoon. The house refused to adjourn, and the roll call was begun on the motion of Mr. McKinley to lay the appeal from the speaker's decision upon the table. The speaker followed the roll call and noted the names of Democrats who declined to vote. When the vote was completed, the speaker took the roll from the clerk and directed him to call the names of Democrats present not voting. Mr. Flower, whose name was in the list, said that he was very much obliged to the speaker for recognizing him as being present. The speaker quickly retorted: "The chair is very glad to be able to recognize the gentleman from New York as present vocally." The announcement that the motion was agreed to and that a quorum was present, was followed by a tumult and uproar. In the midst of it, the speaker recognized Mr. McKinley and the house adjourned. The same obstruction tactics were continued by the Democrats on the following day, various epithets being applied to the speaker. Mr. Bynum spoke excitedly of "the outrageous and damnable ruling of the chair." He said he did not propose "to be silenced or gagged on this floor." Amid the hubbub the speaker stood calm and collected. Mr. Bynum denounced the speaker as a tryant who attempted to vamp up some feeble show to sustain his rulings. "But," cried the member from Indiana grandiloquently, "in the language of the immortal Emmet, we propose to dispute every inch of ground, burn every blade of grass, and the last entrenchment of liberty shall be our graves." Partial order was restored and the speaker said calmly: "The house will not allow itself to be deceived by epithets. No man can describe the action and judgment of this chair in language which will endure unless that description be true. Whenever it becomes apparent that the ordinary and proper parliamentary motions are being used solely for purposes of delay and obstruction; when members break in an unprecedented way over the rules

in regard to the reading of the journal; when a gentleman steps down to the front, amid the applause of his associates on the floor and announces that it is his intention to make opposition in every direction, it then becomes apparent to the house and to the country what the purpose is. It is then the duty of the occupant of the speaker's chair to take, under parliamentary law, the proper course with regard to such matters." The speaker counted a quorum on the question of laying on the table the appeal from the decision of the chair; refused to entertain a dilatory motion to adjourn; and debate on the contested election case began. The obstruction tactics were renewed Saturday and twice the speaker counted a quorum. But the Democrats wearied of the contest and the business of the house proceeded. Speaker Reed triumphed and established the fact that members of the house could not be present for the purpose of making dilatory motions and at the same time be absent to prevent a quorum. An important step was thus taken in parliamentary procedure, and to Speaker Reed the whole country owes a debt of gratitude. The last act in this exciting drama was on the 3rd of February when Smith of West Virginia was seated by one more than a quorum.

The new rules which were adopted by the house February 14th, made out of order, all manifestly dilatory motions; made 100 members instead of a majority, a quorum of the committee of the whole; and permitted the counting of members present and refusing to vote in order to determine whether a quorum was present. This was the practical result of the heated controversy in the house.

February and March were busy months for the Republican members of the ways and means committee. Sessions were held daily and frequently far into the night. Every industry in the land that desired it, was given a hearing; and the history of those hearings upon which was built the McKinley tariff, reveals Mr. Dingley's remarkable grasp of the details of the tariff and the great business interests of the country. Framing a tariff bill is tedious work; and Mr. Dingley's Republican associates on this committee unite in saying that his knowledge of public business was invaluable in the preliminary deliberations over the bill. For two months he was absorbed in the details of this measure. When in his rooms in the Hamilton house he paced the floor hours at a time wholly oblivious of his surroundings. He mentally framed schedules, debated important points, argued questions and met objections. With brow knit as if in deep thought; with pencil and pad on his knees, he

drew forth eloquence from tables of statistics. Callers at his rooms anxious to talk tariff, were always received respectfully and courteously, and listened to patiently. He was deemed a leading spirit in, and a close student of, tariff matters. His devoted wife watched him anxiously, ministering to him as only a fond wife can minister. During these busy weeks she kept up his diary for him, and one day wrote: "For a wonder Nelson is folding his hands."

March 31st the McKinley tariff was completed by the Republican members of the committee and reported to the full committee. Mr. Dingley said: "The sugar duty has been largely reduced and so arranged as to break the trust. This will be welcome news to the people. The duties on farm products have been greatly increased. The duty on wool and woolen goods has been increased. The Republican members of the committee believe that the bill has been so prepared that they can say to the country that they have carried out the long felt want for a high rate on the luxuries and a low rate on the necessities of life." The day before the bill was reported to the house, it was decided by the Republican members of the ways and means committee to put sugar and hides on the free list. Tuesday, April 15th, the McKinley tariff bill was launched in the house. Chairman McKinley presented the detailed report of the Republicans and Mr. Carlisle the report of the minority.

The bill met with warm approval in its general features from the great body of Republicans and protectionists in the country. To be sure the California men, affected by the fact that Californians were the owners of the sugar plantations on the Sandwich islands and heretofore had the munificent advantage of importing these sugars free of duty under the reciprocity treaty with that country, while all other sugar paid a duty of from two to three cents per pound, protested against the proposition of the committee to place sugar and molasses on the free list, and the carpet manufacturers protested against certain restrictive clauses in the bill affecting carpet wools; but otherwise the well nigh unanimous verdict of the Republicans and protectionists of the country was that the committee had succeeded admirably well in harmonizing the thousand divergent interests affected by tariff legislation. The most important change in the proposed tariff was the transfer of molasses and sugar then paying a duty of over 70 per cent, to the free list as to all raw and yellow refined sugars, and the placing of a small duty on white refined sugar. This meant a reduction in the cost of sugar to every family. The proposition to pay a bounty of two cents per pound for fifteen years to encourage sugar production in

this country, received approval as the most economical and effective method of solving the problem as to whether sugar could be produced in this country substantially to the extent of our wants, The increase of duties on those farm products which have been so largely imported as to take the place of articles which our farmers could readily produce to the extent of our wants, was the noticeable feature of the bill. At the last moment hides were placed on the free list because it was ascertained that this country at that time imported mainly only such hides and skins as were needed to make classes of leather for which our hides were not adapted. In all the textile, metal and other schedules of manufactured products, the aim was to so arrange the duties as to give our markets to our own industries. All through the bill the object was to adopt rates "for the better defense of American homes and industries, and while securing the needed revenue, to look to the successful prosecution of industrial enterprises already started and to the opening of new lines of production where our conditions and resources will admit." Both sides of the house prepared for the battle over the tariff.

In the meantime Mr. Dingley was as active as ever in other lines. On the 24th of February he presided over the 56th anniversary of the Congregational Temperance society and made what was deemed "a very interesting address."

A curious incident happened early in March illustrating Mr. Dingley's attention to his applicants for favors and his persistent efforts in their behalf. He received a letter from an old lady in Haverhill, Massachusetts, who had formerly been a constituent of his, asking what had become of a pension bill introduced in her behalf seventeen years before. He took the trouble of looking up the matter personally and found that the bill had been passed and signed by the president. The matter was followed up; and it was found that the woman was entitled to \$2,500 back pension money which she finally secured.

About this time the United States supreme court startled the temperance people of the country with a decision to the effect that the United States has such complete control over inter-state commerce as to prohibit the seizure in original packages, of liquor brought into one state from another. Mr. Dingley said: "If the effects of the decision will be to enable any man in any state to have liquor brought in from another state and sell it in the original package in defiance not only of prohibition but of license laws as well, I regard it as a second Dred Scott decision; as an attempt

on the part of the majority of the supreme court to impose upon the people of the states which prohibit or restrict the liquor traffic. The people of the country will not stand this; and when it is apparent that the decision of the court is affecting this result, the question will be brought into congress, as the court concedes that congress may enact a law to prevent the consequences of their decision."

Under the tariff of 1883 the treasury department was compelled to admit foreign worsted at a lower duty than woolen goods. As a matter of fact worsted goods are woolen goods, the difference being entirely in the process of combing. American manufacturers of worsted goods found themselves unjustly discriminated against. The compensatory duty (that is the duty intended to be equivalent to the duty on the wool if imported) was from ten to twenty-four cents on worsted, and thirty-five cents on woolen cloth. Worsted cloths, having in them the same amount of wool per pound, costing the same and used for the same identical purpose for which woolen cloths were then being used, were coming into the markets of the United States and paying a duty of eighteen and twenty-four cents a pound, when the duty upon the wool of which they were made exceeded thirty-five cents per pound, and when woolen cloth was paying a compensatory duty of thirty-five cents per pound. Mr. Dingley prepared a bill authorizing and directing the secretary of the treasury to classify as woolen cloths "all imports of worsted cloth." The bill came up for debate in the house April 29th. The Democrats under the leadership of Mr. Breckinridge of Kentucky fought the bill. They first tried to talk it to death, then to kill it by amendments. A free wool amendment was offered, but Mr. Dingley made a point of order against it, and the chairman (Mr. Burrows of Michigan) sustained the point of order. The debate was long and sharp, and Mr. Dingley successfully maintained his position. But when the vote was taken on the passage of the bill the Democrats all refused to vote and there was no quorum. The fight was renewed the next day; and the Democrats, still refusing to vote, Speaker Reed counted seventy-five Democrats present but not voting, and declared a quorum present and the bill passed. The bill subsequently passed the senate, was signed by the president and became a law. Mr. Dingley received a large number of telegrams from woolen manufacturers congratulating him on his successful fight for justice to them.

Debate on the McKinley tariff bill began May 7th. Mr. McKinley, chairman of the ways and means committee opened the discussion. It was an interesting day. The members moved nearer the chairman; the galleries were crowded; and the whole country listened to the words of him whose name was already linked with the presidency. Mr. McKinley said in after years, that Mr. Dingley's assistance on this memorable day was invaluable. An intimacy amounting to affection had arisen between these two men; and the first to extend congratulations to the distinguished chairman was Mr. Dingley. Mr. McKinley's speech was a splendid effort, interrupted with frequent and loud applause from the Republican side. Mr. Mills, representing the minority of the ways and means committee and the Democratic free traders, replied in a speech of great length and no little force. He closed with this remarkable peroration: "We will content ourselves by giving our votes against the bill, and when you leave this house and senate with this enormous load of guilt upon your heads and appear before the great tribunal for trial, may the Lord have mercy on your souls." General debate continued until Saturday, May 10th, when Mr. Dingley, who had been previously selected, closed the debate for the Republicans, speaking for an hour and a half. He made the most complete and exhaustive speech of the session. He explained the provisions of the bill, compared it with other tariff bills, exposed the fallacies of the free traders, and paid special attention to the wool and woollen schedules. In commenting on Mr. Mills' argument for free wool, he said that "inasmuch as my friend from Texas gave notice the other day that he proposed to meet the friends of this bill at Philippi I am very sure that he will find the wool-growers on hand whenever he reaches that field. He exploded the "free raw material" theory and the "tariff is a tax" theory, and enlarged upon the importance of preserving our own markets. He closed with this eloquent defense of the measure, and splendid tribute to the chairman: "I favor it because I believe, as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the ways and means committee, has so eloquently said, that it is framed in the interests of the people of the United States; because it is for the better defense of American homes and American industries; because while securing the needed revenue, its provisions look alike to the occupation of our people, their comfort and their welfare."

This speech was pronounced one of the ablest of the entire debate. The Washington correspondent of the New York Tri-

bune said: "Mr. Dingley delivered one of the most exhaustive speeches of the entire debate. There is no better equipped man in the house, and his argument covered almost the entire ground. His exposure of the fallacies of Mills, McMillin and Flower, the three Democratic members of the committee who had spoken, was searching and thorough. He placed on record an array of facts which may be profitably studied by every man, Republican or Democrat, who is interested in the tariff question and desires to study digested information, rather than crude theories or unsupported assertions."

This tariff speech ¹ of Mr. Dingley's was issued as a campaign document by the Republican congressional committee in the succeeding congressional campaign. It was a most effective document.

Consideration of the tariff bill by paragraphs began May 12. On the next day the article of "lime" was reached. Mr. Springer of Illinois attempted to defeat the provision in the bill for a duty of six cents per one hundred pounds, charging that the Maine producers of lime were in a trust. Mr. Dingley denied this and argued for the proposed duty on the ground that manufacturers of lime in New Brunswick, having the advantage of cheaper fuel and labor, could manufacture lime for less money than could the American manufacturers in Maine and the other twenty-one states of the union where lime was manufactured. "In Knox county," said Mr. Dingley, "there were last year made two million barrels of lime, giving direct and indirect employment to thousands of men. A failure to provide sufficient protection to maintain such an industry as this would be a great wrong." Mr. Dingley entered in his diary that day: "I have scored a great victory."

The debate in the house over the McKinley tariff bill was an important and memorable feature of this session of congress. Every feature of the tariff was discussed and American industry and enterprise illuminated as never before. These debates contain a vast array of information as to the industrial and social condition of the country at that time. The debates however were more or less of a partisan nature, interspersed with eloquence, wit, sharp thrusts and bad poetry.

The day upon which the McKinley tariff bill was passed in the house must always stand as the climactic movement of Mr. McKinley's congressional career. The bill, by adroit parliamentary generalship, which had prevented it from being weighed down

1—See Appendix.

with amendments not approved by the committee, had been brought under the operation of the previous question. It stood complete, ready to go forth for good or evil. Upon Mr. McKinley devolved the task of smoothing its path and speeding it upon its way. The scene of which he was at that moment the central figure is one not easily to be forgotten. The occasion, thoroughly advertised, attracted to the capitol an immense throng. The galleries were one mass of humanity, and the anticipation of the vote had compelled the attendance of every member. As usual, Mr. McKinley spoke without notes. His voice, penetrating but not harsh, filled the chamber and was modulated with all the art of an elocutionist. His gestures were those of a man who might have been educated for the stage, graceful and appropriate. His well rounded figure, not above the medium height, was enveloped in a close fitting Prince Albert coat, which, in the sedateness of its cut was thoroughly in keeping with the serious and earnest tones of the speaker. His face, paler than usual, was nevertheless lighted up by the inspiration of the occasion, and as it was turned upward toward the galleries, revealed the lines which reminded the spectator forcibly of the countenance of Napoleon.¹

Chairman McKinley's righthand man throughout this contest of brains and parliamentary skill was Mr. Dingley;² and when on the twenty-first of May the bill passed the house by a vote of 164 to 142 there was great rejoicing among the Republicans and throughout the land. To Mr. Dingley, Chairman McKinley and the other members of the ways and means committee paid a high tribute for his patience, skill, laborious study and valuable assistance.³ Mr. Dingley paid this tribute to Chairman McKinley: "The passage of a new tariff bill through the house under the leadership of William McKinley Jr., of Ohio, has called special attention to this distinguished gentleman, although he was previously known as an able and eloquent Republican leader, and given him additional prominence. The successful piloting of such a bill, involving several thousand items and covering every diversity of industry, through a house having only eighteen Republican majority, is in itself an evidence of great generalship. Conflicting interests must be harmonized and personal ambitions and jealousies in the ranks of the majority party in addition to the as-

1—H. L. West in *Washington Post*.


2—In the campaign of 1892, Mr. McKinley said to the author of this biography: "Mr. Dingley was of invaluable assistance to me in the preparation, presentation and final passage of the tariff bill of 1890. It is not too much to say that it was a Dingley bill rather than a McKinley bill."

saults of the opposition; and no one but a great political leader could have done this. And such a leader—able, skillful, and eloquent—Major McKinley has proved to be. He has proved himself in this conflict worthy of the highest praise. Notwithstanding the Democratic legislature has so gerrymandered Major McKinley's district as to make it impossible for him to be returned to the next congress, yet a leader of so great ability and statesmanship will be recognized by the people and kept in public life." But Mr. Dingley's extreme modesty did not deprive him of deserved congratulations from his fellow Republicans, who were all aware of the important part he took in the struggle.

New England in general and the Boston Home Market club in particular appreciated the great services of the Republican leaders and the latter organization had on the evening of May 31, as their special guests, Hon. Redfield Proctor, secretary of war; Hon. Thomas B. Reed, speaker of the house; Hon. Nelson Dingley Jr., of Maine and Hon. Frederick T. Greenhalge of Massachusetts. The party left Washington the night of May 30. A reception was tendered them the afternoon of May 31. Mr. Dingley was one of the speakers at the banquet and made a splendid impression. ¹ He returned to Washington June 2.

The silver question was still unsettled. The act of 1878 requiring the purchase and coinage of two million dollars worth of silver per month, was not satisfactory to the advocates of either side of the controversy. To the opponents of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, this compulsory purchase of the white metal was simply piling up dollars in the treasury, that were constantly depreciating in bullion value. To the advocates of free and unlimited coinage, this limited coinage was the cause of the decline in the bullion value of silver. The silver question had been agitated continuously for fifteen years; and yet the conditions surrounding it made its immediate solution more difficult than ever. The Republicans were not wholly united; and a caucus of the Republican members of the house was held June '3 to discuss the matter and adopt some measure. The committee on coinage, weights and measures had previously considered several bills and listened to the arguments of many distinguished men, especially "the distinguished secretary of the treasury Mr. Windom, whose personal experience and successful refunding operations during a previous term of service entitled his suggestions to careful consideration and great weight." The bill finally agreed to by the

1—See Appendix.



H. C. LODGE. R. R. HITT.
J. C. BURROWS. BENTON McMILLIN.

committee, was presented to the Republican caucus. Mr. Dingley addressed the caucus briefly, urging the adoption of this measure. The bill was brought into the house June 5 and the debate begun. The measure provided for the purchase at the market rate of silver bullion, of the value of four and one half million dollars per month (which was at that time substantially the American product) and the issue in payment thereof of legal tender treasury notes, redeemable in coin on demand. The bill was a very liberal one in the direction of the increased use of silver as money and in the increase of currency. It was a measure to meet the demands of the advocates of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, who maintained that the decline in the price of silver was due to the fact that the demand for coinage purposes had fallen off. The bill proposed to provide a market for the entire American product; and thus the demand theory would be tested. Mr. Conger of Iowa had the bill in charge, and explained its provisions. The debate was long and exhaustive. Both sides of the controversy were presented with great ability. Mr. Dingley, shortly before the bill was passed, on the afternoon of June 7, spoke ¹ in reply to the advocates of free coinage, making a clear and business-like presentation of the case. He closed by saying that "it is impossible in the present status of silver to dispose of the silver question otherwise than tentatively, and in many respects unscientifically. We are simply waiting in the hope that the gulf now existing between silver bullion and gold will be in due time bridged. We hope and believe that this bill by using more silver as money in such a way as to maintain the parity of our gold and silver coins, will aid in bridging this gulf, when free coinage can safely come. But it cannot safely come now. I appeal to gentlemen who are inclined to vote for free coinage now to meet what they think is a popular clamor, to stop and carefully consider their duty as representatives of the people. Rest assured that in the long run popular approval goes not with votes which respond to ill-considered demands but with votes in which conscience, sound judgment, and patriotism, blend." A motion to recommit the bill with instructions to report a bill providing for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 was defeated by a vote of 140 to 116. The bill was finally passed by a vote of 136 to 119. It is doubtful if free coinage could have been defeated in the house if the Republican leaders had not framed a bill with enough concessions to secure the support of wavering

1—See Appendix.

Republicans so as to make it a party measure. The Republicans put forward Messrs. Cannon, Dingley and McKinley to make the closing arguments for the bill.

On the eleventh of June Mr. Dingley with his wife and daughter (the latter having just graduated from a Washington seminary) left for their home in Maine. That very day he was renominated for congress by the Republicans of his district. Hon. Chas. E. Littlefield who succeeded Mr. Dingley in the house, presided at this convention. Hon. James S. Wright presented Mr. Dingley's name and said in his short speech that the second district was proud of her representative in congress. The nomination was made by acclamation. The resolutions recited the great pride the Republicans of that district took in Mr. Dingley, and "his great and wisely exercised influence in shaping legislation for the welfare of New England workers."

After a few days rest at his home in Lewiston and at his summer residence, he returned to Washington and again took up his public duties.

Debate on the silver bill was resumed in the house when the senate free coinage substitute for the house bill came over into the house June 24. It was the sharpest fight of the session and the hottest day of the month, the thermometer registering 95. On the next day the battle was resumed; and in the midst of confusion, applause, laughter and cries of "sit down," the resolution to consider the house bill with senate amendments was adopted. The motion to concur in the senate free coinage amendment was rejected by a vote of 152 to 135. The announcement of the vote was received with great applause on the Republican side. The house asked for a conference and the senate agreed. The speaker appointed Messrs. Conger, Walker and Bland as the conferees on the part of the house. Senators Sherman and John P. Jones were the conferees on the part of the senate. The conference committee agreed upon a compromise, and reported to both houses July 12. The bill agreed to changed the amount of silver bullion to be purchased, from four and a half million dollars to four and a half million ounces, or so much thereof as may be offered, and the issue in purchase thereof of legal tender treasury notes, redeemable on demand in gold or silver coin at the discretion of the secretary of the treasury. Silver dollars were to be coined at the rate of two million per month until July 1, 1891, after which time only so many silver dollars were to be coined as were required to redeem these treasury notes. Mr. Dingley closed the debate for the Republi-

cans. The conference report was adopted by a vote of 122 to 90. The senate had previously adopted the report and the bill was sent to the president and signed. Mr. Dingley said that "the country is to be congratulated on so fortunate an escape from the great peril of immediate free coinage of silver, by which first owners of silver mines would have been able to dispose of their silver to the government and the people for twenty-eight per cent more than it is worth and finally the currency would have been brought to a silver basis, and gold driven from the country."

July 8, the senate bill to adopt regulations for preventing collisions at sea came into the house, and Mr. Dingley moved its immediate consideration. He explained that the bill provided for the adoption of regulations to prevent collisions at sea, which were unanimously adopted at a recent international marine conference. After a sharp fight the bill was passed.

The "original package" decision of the supreme court stirred the temperance men in congress to action. The senate passed a bill that liquors transported into a state "shall upon arrival in such state or territory be subject to the operation and effect of the laws of such state or territory." The house committee on judicary amended the bill slightly, and in this amended form it came up in the house July 18. Debate continued until the afternoon of July 22, when the bill passed the house and a conference was asked for. Mr. Dingley on the 19th took part in the discussion, making a lengthy and able speech covering the whole question of prohibitory legislation and stoutly defending the Maine law. The bill agreed upon in conference was finally passed in both houses and sent to the president.

On the 21st of July Mr. Dingley left for his summer home in Maine to escape the excessive heat in Washington. He reached Squirrel Island the next day and again joined his happy family circle. How completely he enjoyed this rest! Ten days with his loved ones fortified him for further labors in Washington to which place he returned early in August.

August 12 Mr. Dingley secured the passage through the house of a senate bill amending the shipping commissioner's law providing that when seamen are shipped by American vessels in the coastwise trade, a written agreement shall be made, and that both seamen and vessels shall be subject to the laws regulating the mutual obligations of each in other cases; also a senate bill requiring vessels in collision at sea to stand by each other in order to prevent loss of life. September

1st he left for Maine to take part in the state campaign. Only one week remained before the state election, and Mr. Dingley made the most of it, speaking every night. The Republican victory September 8 was a great surprise. The Republicans did not expect over twelve or fourteen thousand plurality, but the returns showed a Republican plurality of over 18,000. It was evident the people of Maine were well satisfied with the work of the Republican majority in congress. The splendid endorsement given the Republican members of congress and especially Speaker Reed, was a most effective reply to the assaults which had been made on the course of the Republicans in congress in changing the rules, revising the tariff, etc. Mr. Dingley was re-elected by over 4,500 plurality. Hardly had the votes been counted when he hurried back to Washington to resume his seat in the house. He reached there September 11 and was heartily congratulated over the victory in Maine.

Mr. Blaine was an ardent advocate of reciprocity; and when the Republican members of the ways and means committee were framing the tariff bill in the early months of 1890 Mr. Blaine made it known publicly that he thought it was a mistake to place sugar on the free list. He favored keeping sugar on the dutiable list and using it as a means of securing favorable reciprocal relations with sugar-growing countries. Chairman McKinley sent an invitation to Mr. Blaine to appear before the Republican members of the committee. Mr. Blaine accepted the invitation and the conference took place in Chairman McKinley's room in the Ebbitt house February 10. Here occurred the famous hat episode when the secretary of state was both eloquent and angry, smashing his new silk hat over the table in his earnestness. But a majority of the Republicans were opposed to Mr. Blaine's proposition. Then followed the latter's public declaration, so widely copied, that "there is not a section or a line in the bill that will open a market for another bushel of wheat or another barrel of pork." This bold declaration disconcerted the Republican members of the committee. Even Mr. Dingley was disturbed but maintained his usual calm. Of this statement of Secretary Blaine Mr. Dingley said: "Of course in this respect the McKinley tariff bill is like all other tariff bills ever enacted in this country—they have dealt simply with imports and have not touched exports. It could have been said of the tariff of 1846, as well as of the McKinley bill, that there was not a line in it that would open a foreign market for another bushel of wheat or another barrel of pork. That has not heretofore been

regarded as the office of tariffs, but of reciprocal treaties; and the only reason that Secretary Blaine now suggests a topic which usually is treated by treaties and not by tariffs, is because it is proposed to put sugar on the free list in the tariff, and Secretary Blaine thinks it would be wiser to leave sugar on the dutiable list as capital to be used in reciprocal treaties. Secretary Blaine's suggestion in this particular, and his contention, that by leaving sugar for the present on the dutiable list, and making it free only to such sugar-producing countries of this continent as will admit our breadstuffs free of duty, will undoubtedly receive the consideration it deserves. Much is to be said upon the question, and it will be decided with a view to the best interests to the country. But whatever may be done in this particular, it should be borne in mind that in every other respect Mr. Blaine is in hearty accord with the McKinley bill, and resents with proper feeling the attempt of free trade papers to turn his expressions as to one item into an argument against the bill in all other particulars."

The only point of difference between Mr. Blaine and the western Republicans who insisted that sugar should be cheapened two cents per pound by placing it on the free list, was to the extent that reciprocity treaties could be made with sugar-producing countries. If satisfactory treaties could be made with countries that produced sugar enough to supply our consumption, as Secretary Blaine hoped, then that would be equivalent to placing sugar on the free list, and the western Republicans would have been in entire accord with Mr. Blaine's plans. But if treaties could be made only with the two sugar-producing South American countries (which was all that Secretary Blaine claimed when he formulated his views in February) then it would not secure the benefit of free sugar, but would simply be a repetition of the Hawaiian treaty by which we paid five millions annually in remitted duties on sugar obtaining in return from the Sandwich Islands a market for only four millions of our products without having our sugar any cheaper. "With the whole of this controversy," said Mr. Dingley, "narrowed down to this simple point, of whether favorable reciprocal treaties cannot be negotiated with enough sugar-producing countries to supply our consumption, there ought to be no difficulty in reaching a satisfactory conclusion." And a satisfactory conclusion was reached at the famous Cape May conference between President Harrison and Secretary Blaine, August 2. Both reciprocity and free sugar were retained the president prevailing upon his secretary of state to withdraw his objections to free

sugar, and to endorse a plan to secure reciprocity by another route. President Harrison displayed rare skill and diplomacy by thus amicably settling the controversy. When the senate passed the tariff bill September 10, it contained the Aldrich reciprocity amendment that the "exemptions from duty on sugar, molasses, coffee, tea and hides are made with a view to secure reciprocal trade with countries producing these articles," and authorizing the president to restore the duty on these articles coming from countries imposing duties on the agricultural products of the United States "reciprocally unequal and unjust."

Already the long debate in the senate over the consideration of the tariff bill had not only disturbed business, and increased importations in anticipation of higher duties, but also afforded many opportunities for dishonest speculations. The ways and means committee of the house which received the tariff bill from the senate September 12, determined to waste no time; and three days later reported the bill back to the house with a recommendation to non-concur in the senate amendments and to ask for a conference. September 15 after two hours debate, the bill was sent to a conference. The speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the house, Messrs. McKinley, Burrows, Bayne, Dingley, Mills, McMillin and Flower. The conferees on the part of the senate were Messrs. Aldrich, Sherman, Allison, Hiscock, Carlisle, Vance and Voorhees. The Republican members of the conference committee met at Senator Allison's house on the evening of the day on which they were appointed. The following day the full committee met in the senate finance committee room to commence consideration of the disagreements between the two houses on this important tariff bill. The whole business world was watching this conference. Upon its decision hung vast interests. The Republicans decided to caucus, and sessions were held for seven days, afternoon and evening, including Sunday. The differences of the Republican members were talked over; and here Mr. Dingley's rare skill and diplomacy displayed itself. When the Republican conferees adjourned late on the night of September 23, all differences were settled but sugar and binding twine. Two days later all differences were adjusted and on the 26th the Democratic conferees were called in and the report agreed to. As Mr. Dingley predicted, the house sugar schedule was retained, Mr. Dingley's influence accomplishing that result. The labor of preparing and revising the conference report was enormous and Mr. Dingley's mastery of detail was of inestimable value to the conferees. Every

line of the report was scrutinized by him. It was half past five in the afternoon when Chairman McKinley reported the bill agreed to. It was received with cheers on the Republican side. The house adjourned that night to prepare itself for the final vote on the following day. Mr. Dingley recorded in his diary just before retiring to secure needed rest: "I am very tired over the ten days work." Debate on the conference report began the next day, and continued until half past five in the afternoon, Chairman McKinley leading off. Mr. Dingley explained the provisions of the bill agreed upon in a ten minute speech ¹ full of facts and information. He closed by saying: "It is sufficient to say in conclusion that the vociferous condemnation which the bill has received in Europe, in view of the fact that it will encourage the production and manufacture in this country of more than a hundred millions of goods and products now made and produced abroad and sent here to take the place of home products affords sufficient evidence that the measure is one in the interest of American industries, American farmers and American labor." The conference report was agreed to by a vote of 151 to 81. All but three Republicans voted for the bill. There was great applause on the Republican side. The senate agreed to the conference report and the bill passed the last day of September. The first day of October President Harrison signed the bill and the McKinley tariff law became operative. That same day congress adjourned and on the afternoon of October 2nd Mr. Dingley started for home, reaching there the following day. He rested at home for two weeks and on the afternoon of the 18th of October spoke on "American Shipping" before the Boston Commercial club. His address ¹ received full and favorable attention. On the evening of the same day he spoke at Framingham, Massachusetts, returning to Boston late at night. October 21 he spoke at Waltham, returning home the next day. October 25 he addressed a political gathering at Haverhill, Massachusetts, in company with Congressmen Cogswell and Long. The following day he spoke at the Young Men's Republican club in Providence, Rhode Island, with Senator Aldrich. On the last day of the month he made an address at a Republican banquet in Woonsocket, and at noon on the first day of November spoke at Faneuil hall, Boston, going thence to Manchester, New Hampshire, where he addressed a Republican rally in the evening.

Tuesday, November 4th, was election day. The Democrats secured control of the lower house of congress, which was

¹—See Appendix.

not surprising to those who kept close watch of events. The McKinley tariff bill did not become a law until October, leaving barely a month to explain the measure to the voters of the country. It was claimed that the law raised the prices of everything consumed by the people and the Democratic managers were not slow in giving object lessons to the people in the country districts. The McKinley tariff bill and the chairman of the committee that framed it (William McKinley), were denounced by the Democrats from one end of the country to the other. But this denunciation and wide advertising made Mr. McKinley president of the United States. The much abused and much ridiculed man who went down to defeat in this landslide of 1890, seven years later re-entered Washington as the occupant of the White House. But this result at the polls was not a popular condemnation of the McKinley tariff. The new tariff did not have a chance to show its good effects. The Democratic victory proved to be a calamity to the country, because it opened up the way for free trade or low tariff legislation, and for the agitation of the free coinage of silver and the depreciation of the currency.

The remainder of the month of November afforded Mr. Dingley an opportunity to rest. November 15, the 81st anniversary of his father's birthday, and Thanksgiving day, were celebrated by family reunions. The day following Thanksgiving Mr. Dingley and his faithful wife started for Washington, reaching there the next day. Again they took up their work in their cheerful rooms now so homelike. Many old friends and acquaintances were on hand to greet them.

The second session of the fifty-first congress began at noon December 1. President Harrison's message was listened to with unusual interest. This message was an able presentation of the Republican position and was received with marked favor by the business interests of the country. The president said: "There is neither wisdom nor justice in the suggestion that the subject of tariff revision shall be again opened before this tariff has had a fair trial." President Harrison's declarations on silver were cautious. He said that "our very large supply of gold will, if not lost by impure legislation in the supposed interest of silver, give us a position of advantage in promoting a permanent and safe international agreement for the free use of silver." He predicted a large increase in exports as the result of reciprocity plans set on foot by

this century a more shameless prostitution of official responsibility to greed and dishonest finance, has not been recorded. It is a stab the McKinley law. But the Democratic majority in the next congress did not heed this injunction. December passed with nothing of importance done in congress. The only incident of great public interest was the combination in the senate between the Democrats and eight Republicans ¹ to sidetrack the election bill in favor of the finance bill with a free coinage amendment. This was significant as indicating thus early that the Democrats intended to make the free coinage question a leading issue. Mr. Dingley wrote at this time: "Who cannot see the drift of this silver mine policy? It is the attempt of the debtor class to pay off at 75 cents on the dollar, as well as the attempt of the silver mine speculators to sell out at 25 per cent above the market. Where such a policy will land us, where it will impose suffering on the wage earners, those who have good memories need not be told." He early saw the approaching contest over the silver question and warned the people of his state of the dangers of the proposed plan of inflating or depreciating the currency. January 15 he wrote: "Today the greatest combination of American greed is that which is led by the owners of twelve million ounces of silver and of the silver mines. The silver pool means to drive this country to an exclusively silver basis, thus at once putting a premium on gold, diminishing the purchasing power of wages and dislocating and isolating our American fiscal system."

January 6 the senate bill "to place the American merchant marine engaged in the foreign trade upon an equality with that of other nations" was taken up in the house. On the following day Mr. Dingley spoke for two hours in favor of the bill, ² receiving applause and congratulations. He reviewed the causes of the decline of American shipping, and the remedy to be applied. He discussed the British subsidy system and the advantages of the pending bill, concluding with this appeal: "In the light of our own history I appeal to the representatives of the American people to come to the rescue of our merchant marine in the foreign trade, and thus insure commercial independence and national safety before it is too late."

As was predicted, the senate passed a free coinage bill. Mr. Dingley wrote of this incident: "It is not too much to say that in

1—Senators Jones of Nevada, McConnell of Idaho, Shoup of Idaho, Stanford of California, Stewart of Nevada, Teller of Colorado, Washburn of Minnesota and Wolcott of Colorado.

2—See Appendix.

at public and private contract, a surrender on the part of the senate to the speculators in silver who are thus advised that this government will pay them for silver worth one dollar and five cents per ounce in the world's market, the fictitious price of a dollar and twenty-nine cents per ounce. * * * The fact is, one of the foremost isms of the next presidential campaign is made up, as between an honest dollar and a speculative and underweight dollar; as between gold and silver at the world's standard and silver at twenty-five cents more an ounce than it is worth in the market. On this issue the Republican party can afford to stand by what is honest." The passage of the free coinage bill in the senate raised a storm throughout the east. The presence of lobbyists promoting the measure, and suspicious circumstances surrounding its passage, caused Representative Dockery to introduce a resolution asking for the appointment of a committee to investigate "the alleged connection of senators and representatives with the reported silver pool." On the twentieth of September previous, the Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat alleged that twelve senators and fifteen representatives, pending the passage of the silver act of July 14, 1890, were admitted to partnership in various silver pools by which they realized a million dollars profit in the advance of the price of silver after the passage of the act. In accordance with this resolution Speaker Reed appointed Messrs. Dingley, Payne, Rowell, Peel and Oates. Mr. Dingley was averse to assuming the duties and responsibilities of this investigation but the speaker prevailed upon him to accept.

This committee was in session from January 16 to February 24 in the room of the committee on rivers and harbors. The story of this investigation is told in the report written and submitted to the house by Mr. Dingley February 25. ¹ The conclusion of the committee was that there was no evidence that any silver pool gave money to the members of congress, or that members of congress (except Senator Cameron) were interested in silver speculations. Mr. Dingley, however, condemned in unmeasured terms, "the methods employed by owners of silver bullion and silver mines to further legislation, requiring the government or the whole people to buy their silver bullion and pay a dollar and twenty-nine cents per ounce for it when it is worth only one dollar and four cents in the markets of the world."

In the meantime the struggle over the silver question continued in the house. On the sixth of February the friends of this proposi-

1—See Appendix.

tion tacked a free silver rider to an appropriation bill; but the amendment was defeated by eight majority. The silver men were still more confounded by Mr. Dingley's amendment offered February ninth which had a tendency to resurrect the election bill. The Democrats started a plan to enable them to get up the free silver bill. Mr. Dingley quickly proposed to take up the election bill also, whereupon the silver men became alarmed and abandoned their plan. The report of the house committee adverse to the senate free coinage bill, together with the confidence that President Harrison would veto any such measure during his administration, gave assurance that the monetary system of the country would not be disturbed for at least two years.

February 22, Mr. Dingley presided at the annual meeting of the Congregational Temperance society and was re-elected president.

The closing days of the fifty-first congress were, as usual, full of interest. The contest in the house over the bill to place the American merchant marine on a sound footing, was one of the most memorable witnessed in congress for many years. The friends of American shipping in the house committee on merchant marine and fisheries, prepared a substitute bill embodying the main features of the senate and house bill; and after much delay and opposition, succeeded in getting it before the house for final action. The following day the battle was renewed at 10 o'clock in the morning and waged until midnight. The supporters of the bill were led by Mr. Dingley. Amendment after amendment was offered, with a view of killing the bill; but all were skillfully parried by Mr. Dingley on points of order and votes. The debate was under the five minute rule, and was warm and exciting. Mr. Dingley's skill as a debater and parliamentarian was never so apparent. The galleries were filled with spectators who enjoyed the contest of brains. A free ship amendment was defeated by a good majority. Then came the vote on the engrossment of the bill. As this was to be a test vote, the answer of each member was watched with great interest. The Democrats who were expected to vote for the bill failed to do so, and the bill was defeated by every Democratic and fourteen Republican votes. The Democrats cheered the result; but the honors of the debate were with the Republican leaders. Before the vote was announced, Mr. Dingley, who did not propose to give up until he was compelled to, changed his vote from the affirmative to the negative to enable him to move to reconsider in the hope that by fighting the battle over again he could gain enough recruits to at least get the bill into conference. Absent members were drummed up in every direction.

He was rewarded for his persistence, and his motion to reconsider was carried by a vote of 147 to 143. At this point, Mr. Cannon of Illinois who had voted for the bill, but who favored only subsidy to mail steamships, moved to recommit with instructions to report forthwith the senate postal steamship bill as a substitute. The motion prevailed, the senate bill was reported out and a conference asked for. The following Monday the senate concurred in the subsidy bill, but the tonnage bill was defeated.

Congress was in session all day and all night March 3; and after hours of confusion, adjourned at noon March 4. Mr. Dingley remained at his post all night. The Democrats could not overlook Speaker Reed's rulings in behalf of business methods in congress, and when the usual resolution of thanks was offered just before adjournment, they voted against it; but it carried and the result was greeted with cheers. The speaker in his parting address, which was delivered with unusual calmness, said that the last week of the closing congress having been largely of a political nature, had aroused the most turbulent passions known to the human race, and it was the part of wisdom to wait for history to give the verdict on the deeds of the fifty-first congress.

The fifty-first congress passed into history as one of the most memorable on record. As Mr. Reed said, it was not so much what it had done, as what it had rendered possible for all time to be done.

Mr. Dingley added to his reputation as a profound and practical student of public affairs. He was now an authority on shipping and tariff matters. He wisely devoted his time and attention to a few subjects until he completely mastered them. In no other way can a member of congress be strong and influential.

March 9 in company with his wife and daughter, he left Washington for his home in Maine, stopping at New York, New Haven and Boston for a brief recreation and rest. He reached his home March 25, and on that day wrote in his diary: "It seems good to be at home again."

The months of April and May afforded this busy man more than the usual time for rest. He gave much of his time to his family, joining in the pleasures of home concerts, fishing trips and fireside talks. The middle of May, in company with one of his sons, he spent several days fishing on Rangeley lakes. The first day of June he started for Saratoga, and on the following day presided at the sixty-fifth annual meeting of the American Home Missionary society.

June 9 he received news of the death of his youngest granddaughter, which was a great shock to him. "This reminds us of our little Charley's death in 1862," he wrote in his diary.

Late in June he spent a week in the Rangeley lake region rusticated and fishing. The last day of June he recorded in his diary: "I caught a six pound salmon after an hour's struggle in getting him in." Returning to his home he learned of the death of Hannibal Hamlin and attended the funeral of the distinguished statesman at Bangor, July 8. The following day he joined his family at his summer home, Squirrel Island.

Mr. Dingley's literary work this spring and summer consisted of editorials for the Lewiston Journal, temperance addresses and an article on "The State of Maine" for the New England magazine.¹ This article was widely copied in New England. "The billion dollar congress," "Causes of bad times," "The money question," "The basis of competition," and "What makes interest," were some of the subjects treated by him editorially. August 29 he delivered a temperance address¹ at Old Orchard.

This summer season at the seashore was a period of joy and rest for Mr. Dingley. In the family circle, surrounded by wife, children and grandchildren, he found perfect peace. The season was over September 3 and Mr. Dingley and family returned to their home in Lewiston. About the middle of the month he completed his vacation by going to Moosehead lake. September 20, Rev. Mr. Howe, pastor of the Congregational church at Lewiston, where Mr. Dingley had attended services for so many years, was welcomed home from Europe and Mr. Dingley was chosen to make the brief address of welcome. October 2 he visited Hanover, N. H., and old Dartmouth college, where he had graduated in 1855, and addressed the students on the tariff question from the protection standpoint.¹ This address was scholarly and profound. October 14 he addressed a political meeting at Lowell, and on the following day at Brockton with former Speaker Reed. He also spoke at East Boston and Millbury before the campaign in Massachusetts closed. The November elections showed uniform Republican gains. William McKinley was elected governor of Ohio and Mr. Dingley sent him happy congratulations. November passed quickly, and with it came many happy family reunions. Thanksgiving day was especially enjoyable, and a week later Mr. Dingley with his wife and daughter returned to Washington.

¹—See Appendix.

CHAPTER XVIII.

1891-1893.

It is conceded now that the McKinley tariff act of 1890 was not understood by the people. Had it been otherwise, the house of representatives in the fifty-second congress would not have contained 237 Democrats, 85 Republicans and 10 Alliance men. Importers assailed the act in the United States supreme court, and sought to bring in question its constitutionality. It was argued that the bounty on sugar vitiated the whole act; that the reciprocity provision was unconstitutional, because it delegated legislative powers to the executive; that the tobacco clause was not contained in the bill signed by the president. The fight against protection was carried to the court of last resort, but happily not sustained by that judicial body. The domestic business world was alarmed over the result at the polls in 1890, and viewed with consternation the possibility of another defeat of the party of protection in the approaching presidential election.

The first session of the fifty-second congress began in the midst of alarm. The country watched the struggle between the two wings of the Democracy, the one headed by Cleveland, Carlisle and Mills, bent on practical free trade; the other headed by Hill, Gorman and Crisp, bent on a moderate revision of the tariff.

The fight between the five candidates for speaker in the Democratic caucus (Mills, Crisp, McMillin, Springer and Hatch) was long and bitter. After a desperate struggle lasting three days, the nomination of Crisp was brought about on the thirtieth ballot. The victory of Crisp brought clearly to the front the issue of free silver coinage. The Democratic party was distinctly for free silver, but

the Mills and Cleveland wing was in favor of sidetracking the silver issue and making the fight on the free trade issue exclusively. The victory of the Hill Democracy in the house was an announcement that the chief issue of the approaching campaign was to be the silver issue. In the words of Mr. Dingley, "it is now deliberately proposed by the Democratic party to cut loose from the standard of value of commercial and civilized peoples. * * * It is settled that free coinage is dear to the heart of the national Democracy and that the supremacy of the Democratic party means confusion to American finance."

The message of President Harrison brought a measure of confidence to the country. He recommended that existing laws be given a fair trial and that the business interests "be spared the distressing influence which threats of radical changes always impart." The president's declaration that "the free coinage of silver under existing conditions would disastrously affect the business interests at home and abroad," met a responsive chord.

Two days before Christmas, Speaker Crisp announced his commitments. Mr. Dingley was placed on the committee on appropriations, Columbian exposition and expenditures in the department of justice. His first committee place was the only one of any importance and during the course of the session afforded him a good opportunity to learn the actual operations of the government. He said in after years that a term of service on the appropriations committee was necessary to equip a member for work in congress. William M. Springer of Illinois was made chairman of the ways and means committee.

In this house were—Herbert, Oates and Wheeler of Alabama; Turner, Crisp and Blount of Georgia; Hopkins, Hitt, Henderson and Springer of Illinois, Holman and Shrively of Indiana; Henderson, Dolliver and Hull of Iowa; Simpson of Kansas; Breckinridge and McCreary of Kentucky; Reed, Dingley Milliken and Boutelle of Maine; Lodge, Sherman Hoar and George F. Williams of Massachusetts; O'Donnell, Burrows and Wheeler of Michigan; Catchings of Mississippi; Hatch, Dockery, O'Neill, Cobb and DeArmond of Missouri; Fellows and Cummings of New York; Bryan of Nebraska; Outhwaite and Johnson of Ohio; Bingham and O'Neill, W. A. Stone and C. W. Stone of Pennsylvania; Tillman of South Carolina; McMillin and Richardson of Tennessee; Bailey, Mills and Sayres of Texas; Wise of Virginia; Wilson of West Virginia; all of whom played an important part. Two notable men—William D. Kelley of Pennsylvania and Samuel S. Cox of New York

—passed away during the first session of the previous congress, in the spring of 1890. The death of the member from New York was a shock to Mr. Dingley, for they were warm friends and intimately associated in public service. Mr. Cox was the embodiment of generosity and kindness and many members of congress were recipients of his favors. He died genuinely mourned by many.

Congress adjourned Dec. 23 for the holiday recess. During this season Mr. Dingley busied himself in the preparation of a tariff speech, and derived much joy from the constant presence in his rooms of his wife and daughter. A little music, a game of whist, a quiet chat formed the evening diversions of this little family circle. January 1, 1892, in company with his daughter, Mr. Dingley made New Year's calls on the members of the cabinet.

When congress reassembled, Mr. Dingley introduced a bill for the appointment of a commission on the alcoholic liquor traffic, and to establish a marine board for the advancement of the merchant marine.

Mr. Dingley's broad views on the objects of government and the proper scope of public expenditures, were displayed in a debate over Holman's anti-subsidy resolution. Jan. 14, Mr. Holman of Indiana, who enjoyed the reputation of being the economical member of the house and was called "the watchdog of the treasury," offered a resolution that "no money ought to be appropriated by congress from the public treasury except such as is manifestly necessary to carry on the several departments frugally, efficiently and honestly administered." Mr. Dingley attempted to secure consideration of a substitute resolution more definite in its nature, but the house objected. In the course of the debate he replied at some length to Mr. Holman. ¹ He advocated a broad application of the principle that all appropriations should be for public and not for private purposes. He defended the appropriations of the fifty-first congress and denied that the country was on the verge of bankruptcy. The debate covered the whole field of government finance, and the resolution on the third day was finally adopted.

On the sixteenth of October, 1891, a considerable number of the sailors of the United States steamship *Baltimore*, then in the harbor of Valparaiso, were assaulted by armed men nearly simultaneously in different localities in the city. One petty officer was killed outright and seven or eight seamen were seriously wounded, one of whom subsequently died. Relative to the president's message about the trouble Mr. Dingley said that "the message is a

1—See Appendix.

very strong one and presents the American side of the Chilian matter very ably. I do not doubt that congress will sustain the president in maintaining the dignity and honor of this country, even to the extent of war if that should be clearly necessary. I hope, however, that the difficulty will be arranged without going to such lengths as that. War is a very serious matter, and every means should be exhausted for an amicable solution before there is an appeal to arms. Chili is so weak a power that we should bear and forbear to a greater extent than we might with a much stronger power, and especially is this the case in the disturbed condition in which Chili is at present."

Debate over the new rules began January 26. Mr. Reed of Maine took occasion to make one of his richly sarcastic and pointed speeches in which he rejoiced that the Democratic party was "finally catching up with the procession." He called attention to the fact that the Democratic majority in the fifty-second congress was adopting what the Democratic minority denounced in the fifty-first congress as "tyranny." Mr. Dingley addressed the house on the 27th,¹ giving special attention to the proposed rule to permit legislative riders on appropriation bills. This he again strenuously opposed on the second of February.¹ After a protracted discussion and in the third month of the session, the new rules of the house were adopted. They were in the main the old filibustering rules of the fiftieth congress with some slight improvements.

On the 18th of December Mr. Dingley called on Secretary Blaine at his residence in Washington. The secretary appeared to be in excellent health and greeted his old friend cordially. The conversation naturally drifted to the approaching Republican national convention at Minneapolis, and the secretary cautiously asked Mr. Dingley his opinion.

"You can be nominated if you say the word," said Mr. Dingley.

"But I do not desire to embarrass my friends," said the secretary. "I cannot announce that I am a candidate and still remain in the cabinet of President Harrison. On the other hand if I refuse to yield to the pressure brought to bear on me I shall be charged with deserting my friends."

The secretary was visibly troubled and nervously paced the floor as he talked. He went over the whole situation and discussed freely his personal relations with President Harrison, which he declared were pleasant. He admitted that he had told his friends he was not a candidate before the convention but would accept the nomination if tendered him.

¹—See Appendix.

"Governor," said the secretary, stopping abruptly, "my preference is to remain in the cabinet. My work as secretary of state was sadly interrupted by the death of President Garfield. The country never fully understood my policy. I desire to complete the work I have now undertaken. I do not feel that my health will admit of my going through another presidential campaign."

"Then your true course is to announce publicly as soon as possible your decision to retire absolutely from the race," replied Mr. Dingley.

It was a struggle between the ambition of his life and what he knew was his duty to himself and his family. His decision was speedily made. But it was not until February 6 that the political world was startled by the publication of a letter to General J. S. Clarkson, chairman of the Republican national committee, in which Mr. Blaine announced emphatically that he was not a candidate for the presidency and that his name would not go before the Republican national convention. "To those who have tendered me their support I owe my sincere thanks, and am most grateful for their confidence," he wrote. This apparently ended the matter and President Harrison's nomination appeared inevitable. But the popular demand for Mr. Blaine's nomination seemed to increase and with it returned the vigor and ambition of the "Plumed Knight." Excitement increased and the Blaine boom seemed to grow in strength. The secretary of state listened with throbbing heart to the sweet sounds of popularity, and his mind recalled the exciting scenes of 1876, of 1880 and of 1884. His judgment prompted him to cling to his determination to avoid another contest; his ambition and that of his family urged him to yield. He did yield. He measured with accuracy the great popular clamor, but he failed to take into account the formidable organization of his chief. What a pity he did not follow the advice of his wise and good friend, Mr. Dingley! On the fourth of June, while the delegates were assembling at Minneapolis, the news was flashed over the wires that Secretary Blaine had resigned from the cabinet. "The condition of public business," he wrote to President Harrison, "in the department of state, justifies me in requesting that my resignation may be accepted immediately." The president replied with equal brevity: "The terms in which you state your desires are such as to leave me no choice but to accede to your wishes at once." The resignation plunged Washington and congress into a fever of excitement. It was accepted by the country as an indication that Mr. Blaine had decided to accept the nomination for the presidency if tendered

him. The brevity of the correspondence gave rise to the rumor that the relations between Mr. Blaine and the president were not cordial. But these reports were magnified. Mr. Blaine was annoyed and worried over the public insinuation that he was not acting honorably toward his chief. His physical and mental condition caused him to be irritated and to entertain fancied grievance. He was not the cool diplomat and polished secretary of 1881; he was the sick and dispirited secretary of 1892. Mr. Blaine was not himself. On the fourth of June he held a conference with a Canadian official on a question pending between the state department and the Dominion. John W. Foster, who had been attending to some diplomatic matter during Secretary Blaine's illness, was present, and interrupted the secretary by saying that the latter, in his statement of the case, was not representing the views of the president. He forthwith proceeded to state the president's views. "Gentlemen," said the secretary abruptly, "this conference is adjourned." And he quickly left the room, immediately tendering his resignation. He performed the act in a moment of indignation. It was done before he realized its full significance. The resignation was received in Minneapolis with a shout of joy by the friends of Mr. Blaine who cordially disliked President Harrison, and by stolid indifference by the instructed Harrison delegates. The struggle between the two forces began. The discipline of the one triumphed over the noisy enthusiasm of the other. President Harrison was renominated on the first ballot and Whitelaw Reid, editor of the New York Tribune, was nominated for vice president.

The circumstances surrounding the resignation and defeat of Mr. Blaine and the full realization that he was being used by ambitious men to further their own interests, brought genuine regret and sorrow to the secretary's friends and admirers. Mr. Dingley's only comment was: "I regret the whole affair more than I can express." But his admiration for Mr. Blaine continued, and in commenting on his services as secretary of state, he said: "The retirement of Mr. Blaine from the position of secretary of state has caused not only great regret, but also general expressions of the debt of gratitude which the country owes the brilliant secretary for the magnificent service he has done during his three years occupancy of this position. * * * It is sufficient to say that the ability and skill with which the secretary conducted the state department, reflects the highest credit on that statesman and on this country, and furnishes another ground for lasting gratitude to Maine's great leader, James G. Blaine."

The house finally began to do business early in February. On the fifth of that month while the census deficiency bill was under discussion Mr. Sayers of Texas made certain charges against the superintendent of the census (Mr. Robert Porter) with reference to the conduct of his office. Mr. Dingley defended the superintendent in a vigorous speech. He argued that if more men had been employed in the census department than were necessary, the matter should have been brought up in committee. "I desire to say," he added, "that so far as our investigations have gone, we have found that the work of the census office has been expedited at least a year ahead of what was the case in the tenth census." Mr. Simpson of Kansas attempted to make a political point from the mortgage statistics but Mr. Dingley turned the tables on him. February 9 he replied at some length to Mr. Dockery of Missouri who, in a partisan speech, denounced the last congress as a billion dollar congress which had imposed upon the country extravagant appropriations. Taking this as his text, Mr. Dingley showed conclusively that the fiftieth congress (Democratic) did not appropriate enough by thirty-eight and one half million dollars for the ordinary expenses of the government, and that the fifty-first congress was obliged to make up this deficiency. The whole field of government appropriations and expenditures was analyzed, and a bright light thrown upon the true way of legislating for the benefit of a growing and progressive nation. He closed with these words: "Now, Mr. Chairman, in approaching the subject of appropriations, it seems to me that we ought to approach it as statesmen and patriots, and not with any low hustings motives. We are charged, with the best interests of the nation, and if we do not fulfill our trust, appropriating wisely where appropriation will be wise, I am sure that history will record that we have been faithless to the responsibilities put upon us. Let us rise to the height of the occasion. Let us be statesmen in this matter and cease this bickering as to whether this congress or that congress has spent a dollar more or a dollar less than some other. There must necessarily be variations in appropriations from year to year. I take it that one side of this house is as desirous of avoiding improper appropriations as the other side. It is not a partisan question. Let us strip it of partisanship and approach this subject in the spirit in which it should be considered, for I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that if we do so we shall cease such unprofitable criticism as has already been made on this and that item, and shall be willing to vote for a reasonable sum for the protection and the promotion of the interests of this

nation, and the greatest nation upon the face of the earth, a nation that in the lifetime of some gentlemen on this floor, is to number a population of more than one hundred millions of people; a nation that stands for all that is noble, for all that relates to the advancement of human liberty; a nation that is the hope of the world."

This lofty sentiment was greeted with prolonged applause. It was a kind rebuke to the critics on the Democratic side, none of whom replied. This speech was liberally used as a campaign document by the Republican national committee.

Mr. Dingley, on his sixtieth birthday (February 15), recorded in his diary: "I can hardly realize it, for I seem as lithe and young as I did thirty years ago. The fact remains, however, that I am passing the milestone." March 6, he presided and spoke at the Congregational Temperance society anniversary in Washington. He was re-elected president.

As the business of the house progressed, the quarrel between the two factions of the Democratic party became more evident. On the eighteenth of February Mr. Bland undertook to crush Mr. Harter of Ohio, a Cleveland champion, and an opponent of free silver. The latter in a circular letter to commanders of Grand Army posts, denounced the free and unlimited coinage of silver, as injurious to all veteran soldiers drawing pensions. The debate between Bland and Harter was sharp and at times acrimonious, much to the amusement of the Republicans. The Democratic party was discomfited by the frequent factional controversies in the house, and was further weakened by the decision of the United States supreme court on the last day of February, sustaining the counting of a quorum by Speaker Reed in the fifty-first congress and sustaining the constitutionality of the McKinley tariff act of 1890. The court unanimously decided, first, that the Dingley worsted act passed by the action of Speaker Reed in counting a quorum of members present but not voting, was enacted by a legal quorum; second, that the reciprocity act gave the executive no legislative power.


The Democrats were making a political issue of appropriations, attempting to create the impression that they were economical and the Republicans extravagant. General appropriation bills were pared down in the house; but it was observed that many Democrats (including Mr. Holman of Indiana) voted for appropriations for public buildings in their districts. The object of this was obvious. In order to bring these economical members from under cover, Mr. Dingley presented a resolution for reference, that "it is inexpedient

at the present session, to appropriate money for public buildings that have been ordered, thus leaving these appropriations to be made next winter after the next presidential election, when the issue of appropriations and economy will no longer be a part of the Democratic program." The resolution was referred to a committee and there suppressed. Mr. Dingley again called attention to the method pursued by the controlling party, when the District of Columbia bill was under consideration. He said that the economy proposed would simply cripple and retard public work in Washington, and the next congress would be called upon to appropriate more money than usual to complete the work.


Monday, March 7, was a field day in the house. The resolution reported by the committee on rules to set apart three days for the consideration of the free silver bill, was, after a sharp fight, adopted by a vote of 190 to 85. Thus completely was the house in the control of the free silver Democrats. Many Republicans voted for the resolution feeling that this important matter should be met and decided at once. A consideration of the question would compel every member of the house to show his colors. Debate on the bill to admit silver to free and unlimited coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1, began in the house March 22. Mr. Bland of Missouri opened the debate in a speech of great length. He argued in favor of the bill. The silver question was exhausted as it was never exhausted before in debate. The discussion covered over two hundred pages of the congressional record. On the third day (March 24) Mr. Dingley spoke against the bill. ¹ He closed with these words: "In the interest of farmers and workingmen, in the interest of all classes, I appeal to this house to at once lay upon the table the pending bill, which is already creating business distrust and injuring the material interests of the people, and thereby announce to the country that there is on further danger at present from mischievous schemes to depreciate the standard by which values are compared, and disorder the currency in which business is transacted." The battle waged far into the night. The sergeant-at-arms was called to preserve order and the excited members refused to take their seats. A call of the house was ordered but a quorum could not be mustered. Finally at thirty minutes past midnight, Mr. Bland, realizing that no business could be done, moved that the house adjourn. This was done and the bill thus failed to pass. There was great rejoicing among the opponents of the measure.

An analysis of the vote on this free silver coinage bill, showed

1—See Appendix.



JOHN D. LONG. A. I. HOPKINS.
JOHN DALZELL. AMOS J. CUMMINGS.



that 66 per cent of the Democrats in the house and only fifteen per cent of the Republicans were in favor of the bill. In view of this fact it appears that the success of the Democratic party in the approaching campaign would mean free silver coinage. Notwithstanding the charge that it was Mr. Cleveland's influence that defeated this free silver coinage bill, nevertheless he was nominated by his party. But when elected, he refused to be guided by the views of the majority of his supporters on the money question, and was therefore practically driven out of his party as then constituted.

Debate on the tariff began in the house March 9, on the bill to place wool on the free list and to reduce the duties on woollen goods. This bill was made a text for a violent attack on the McKinley law and the whole system of protection represented by the Republican party. Mr. McMillin of Tennessee opened the debate, making a strong plea for a low tariff and "a reduction of taxes." He closed with this challenge: "Let the battle wage, and the fiercer the better, until some recognition is given to the principle that taxes should be levied and collected for the support of the government rather than for the oppression of the many at the behest and for the benefit of the few."

Mr. Dingley was put forward by the Republicans to answer Mr. McMillin and to present the main argument¹ in defense of the Republican policy and the McKinley law. He began speaking at half past two in the afternoon and spoke for two hours. When a motion was made to adjourn there were cries of "Let him go on." But at his request, because he was fatigued, the house adjourned and he was given permission to complete his speech on the following day. He spoke for an hour the next day; and at the close there was prolonged applause on both sides of the house. Throughout his remarks he was interrupted by members on the Democratic side. Mr. Bryan of Nebraska (a new member) plied frequent questions with a view of disconcerting Mr. Dingley, whereupon Mr. Johnson of Indiana sarcastically suggested that "the gentleman from Nebraska, on account of his being a new member and on account of his well known modesty and disposition to avoid being brought into undue prominence, be permitted to proceed with his argument and that the gentleman from Maine, who has been constantly interrupted, be required to sit down and give him a fair chance." This remarkable address of Mr. Dingley's was listened to attentively by the members on both sides of the house. It was like a great master instructing his pupils. The arguments were unanswerable and the facts undis-

1—See Appendix.

putable. His vast store of information armed him completely for the struggle with the leaders on the Democratic side who repeatedly sought to ensnare him. He closed with these words: "I ask gentlemen to bear in mind that this country, under the policy of protection, has become the largest agricultural, the largest manufacturing, the largest mining, and the most prosperous country on the face of the earth. What has been accomplished in the past under this policy invites its continuance for the future. Let us be true to that policy which has carried the nation to such a height of prosperity." This was pronounced the ablest tariff speech in favor of protection delivered in the house during that session. Millions of copies were sent into the several states by the Republican national committee. The speech met with universal praise and commendation. Mr. Turner of Georgia followed Mr. Dingley, and in the course of his speech said: "I commend the great tact, judgment and discretion which the gentlemen on my right have shown in selecting the able and distinguished gentleman to open the debate for that side. He has a training in economic education unsurpassed by that of any other man in his party. In the school of protection he is not only a graduate, but without meaning any disparagement of his political associates here, he has among them no superior."

March sixteenth Mr. Bryan of Nebraska made an elaborate speech in favor of the bill and against the protective tariff policy. He closed with these words: "If it (the Democratic party) comes into power in all of the departments of this government it will not destroy industry; it will not injure labor; but it will save to the men who produce the wealth of the country a larger portion of that wealth. It will bring prosperity and joy and happiness, not to a few, but to everyone without regard to station or condition." Subsequent history, however, proved that Mr. Bryan was not a true prophet. This speech called public attention to the member from Nebraska and helped to make him the presidential nominee of the Democratic party in 1896.

April 26, Mr. Dingley was unanimously renominated for representative in congress by the Republicans of his district. The convention tendered its thanks to Mr. Dingley "for the fidelity and ability with which he had represented the interests of the people of his district, and for his very effective opposition to the Democratic plans on the one hand to deprive the farmers of Maine and of the country of the protection so long and justly accorded to so important a farm product as wool, and on the other hand to destroy

so important an industry and instrument of national defense as ship building by admitting all foreign built vessels to an American registry free of duty."

On the tenth of May the house discussed the sundry civil appropriation bill, and Mr. Dingley spoke briefly¹ relative to the campaign cry, "a billion dollar congress," raised by the Democrats, showing conclusively that there was nothing in it. He presented the official figures showing that the apparent expenditures, including the interest on the war debt, were three hundred and fifty-five million dollars in 1891 and three hundred and forty-five million dollars in 1892—seven hundred millions for the two years—three hundred millions less than a billion.

Late in May, the American Home Missionary society held its sixty-sixth annual meeting in Washington. Mr. Dingley presided until General O. O. Howard was elected president on the closing night.

March 18 and 19 while the sundry civil bill was under discussion, the silver leaders sought to have a free silver coinage amendment attached. Mr. Dingley made a point of order against the amendment, which the chairman sustained. Mr. Bland appealed, but the committee of the whole sustained the chair. This ended all attempts at this session to pass a free silver coinage bill through the house. June 22, he spoke briefly on the general deficiency appropriation bill. On the following day he went to New York, thence to New Haven where one of his sons graduated from Yale university. June 28 he reached Lewiston and on the following day was at his island home. Here he was joined by his wife, children and grandchildren; and once more the happy family reunion filled his heart with joy. Here he obtained perfect rest.

Grover Cleveland was nominated for president by the national Democratic party after a prolonged fight. He was opposed to the attitude of a majority of his party on the silver question; but the inconsistency was partly concealed by the adoption of a platform that straddled the money question, by declaring for the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, "but the dollar unit of coinage of both metals must be of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value." The Democratic party seemed to occupy substantially the same position that the Republican party occupied on the money question, both declaring that the free coinage of silver was impossible except by international agreement. But less than a month after the adoption of this platform, on the first day of July,

1—See Appendix.

every Democrat in the senate but seven united with eleven Republican senators from the silver producing states, and passed a free silver coinage bill by a vote of 29 to 25. Thus a majority of the Democrats of both houses stood squarely against the declaration of the Democratic national platform.

July 8, Mr. Dingley left Squirrel Island for Washington, reaching there the following day. Four days later the house by a vote of 136 to 154, refused to adopt a rule for the consideration of the senate free silver bill. This ended all possibility of free silver coinage legislation at this session of congress. Of the one hundred and thirty-six votes for the bill, 130 were Democrats and six were Republicans.

July 19, the house on motion of Mr. Dingley, concurred in the senate amendment to the sundry civil appropriation bill, appropriating money to the World's Columbian exposition, closing the exposition on Sundays. On the previous day Mr. Dingley had addressed the house¹ on the World's exposition, the importance of closing it on Sundays, and of excluding the liquor traffic from the exposition grounds. For a day the majority leaders filibustered over the bill and finally, on the 27th of July, it passed the house. The sundry civil bill, the last, was passed August 5, and at 11 o'clock at night the first session of the fifty-second congress came to an end. With a two-thirds majority in the house, the controlling party failed to enact any important legislation outside of the appropriation bills. Mr. Dingley's work throughout the session was necessarily largely of a negative kind, except that portion devoted to the appropriation bills. Here he won a reputation for accuracy and detail second to none in the house. His speeches, moreover, furnished the Republicans with a large amount of valuable matter for campaign purposes. Finally, he served his country well by ably assisting in the defeat of free coinage and the free admission of wool.

August 7 Mr. Dingley left Washington for his island home, reaching there on the 9th. On the 16th he entered the state campaign, speaking nearly every night until election day September 12. The Republicans carried the state by 12,000 and Mr. Dingley was re-elected to congress by three thousand seven hundred plurality, running three hundred ahead of the state ticket. One of the prominent speakers in this state campaign was William McKinley of Ohio. He spent a night in Lewiston, Maine, and was entertained by Mrs. Dingley and her family, Mr. Dingley being away on a

1—See Appendix.

stumping tour. At tea, the conversation naturally drifted to politics and the approaching national campaign. Mrs. Dingley ventured to remark to Mr. McKinley: "Mr. Dingley says, Mr. McKinley, that he would give more for your chances of securing the presidential nomination four years hence than for the chances of any other man." Mr. McKinley smiled in his characteristic way, sipped his tea and replied diplomatically: "Mr. Dingley would make a capital secretary of the treasury; and if I am ever president I will urge him to accept that place." Subsequent events proved Mr. Dingley's foresight to be prophetic; and Mr. McKinley kept his word.

On Friday following election, Mr. Dingley in company with one of his sons spent a week in Rangely lakes fishing and hunting. One night they camped out in the forest sleeping on fir boughs, with a big fire at their feet. He wrote in his diary: "The screech owls made unearthly noises at intervals through the night. It was a wild and weird scene. For breakfast we had coffee and bread with fried pork, using a log for a table." October 3 in company with his family he went to New York, remaining there until the 6th. From this place he started on a stumping tour through New York state. He spoke at Watkins, Owego, Moravia, Auburn, Geneva, Charlotte, Medina, and Lockport. At every place he was greeted with immense crowds. He joined his family in New York city October 14, remaining there two days. October 17 and 18 he visited a son in Michigan, going to Chicago the following day. Here in company with his wife he visited the Columbian exposition. As a member of the World's Fair committee he was given a position of honor in the grand procession October 21. On the 24th he returned to New York city going thence to Middletown, Conn., where he addressed a political meeting. He made political addresses at Concord and Manchester, N. H., and reached his home in Lewiston October 29th. His bronchial affection and throat trouble annoyed him exceedingly and for several days he was confined to the house.

The presidential campaign of 1892 was a hard fought battle. Every means was employed to get out the voter; but President Harrison was defeated and Grover Cleveland elected. The solid south and the so-called independent or "mugwump" vote accomplished this result. Five northern states—New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Indiana and Illinois—went Democratic. Mr. Dingley said the day after election: "While I believe that this country is so great and has such recuperative powers that it will prosper to

a certain extent under any policy however unwise, yet we cannot but feel that the placing of the Democratic party in power under the reactionary tendencies of the controlling elements of that party located in the south, will be deeply regretted by the American people before the four years are past. If the victory of the Democracy now shall result in giving the Democrats control of the senate, the thousands of voters who have supported Cleveland but who have no faith in his party, will have a rude awakening from their dreams of confidence. The one thing, however, which has had the most to do with placing the Democratic party in power again, is the glamor which in so many minds hangs around Mr. Cleveland because it is thought that he is so much better than his party. If the country could see for two years the Democratic tariff policy and the Democratic financial policy—that which the majority and controlling wing of the party believes in, practically applied before 1896, we should have such a Republican victory at that time as has not been known for twenty years." This was true political prophecy. He added: "The stern fact stares us in the face that England's rejoicing over a policy which compels us to give up manufacturing industries here and to transfer them to Great Britain, may be in order for her; but it ought to put us to shame that we contemplate surrendering what legitimately and properly belongs to our own people—what used by us will in the end accomplish the most for mankind, on the false and unchristian theory that it is the duty of a nation to take care first of other nations in the hope that they will turn around and take care of ourselves. That nation does most for mankind, just as that family does the most for society, that first of all looks to making the most of its own."

The election of Mr. Cleveland was accomplished largely by the cry that the rich were growing richer and the poor poorer. An appeal was made to every person who felt that he did not have his share of the world's riches. It was promised that in some mysterious way, if the Democrats were placed in power, poverty would disappear and all would be prosperous and happy. Mr. Cleveland said in his letter of acceptance: "The workingman, suffering from the importation and employment of pauper labor, instigated by his friends, seeking security for his interests in organized co-operation, still waits for a division of the advantages secured by his employer under the cover of a generous solicitude for his wages." This was a direct appeal to the labor vote, and that vote went largely to Mr. Cleveland and assisted materially in his election. But as Mr. Blaine said, soon after the election: "The Democratic policy will be

judged solely by its fruits. If the poor do not become richer and the rich less selfish, Mr. Cleveland's theories will be a failure, and the Democratic campaign a fraud."

Another Thanksgiving with its happy family reunion and longings for the absent ones, passed by; and on the second of December Mr. Dingley was again at his post in Washington. Saturday night before congress met, he was joined by his devoted wife; and before the open fire in their comfortable rooms at the Hamilton house, they again took up the duties and pleasures of a Washington winter.

The second session of this congress was uneventful. Both political parties seemed to "rest on their oars" after the tremendous struggle of the previous campaign. Because of a decision on the part of the people in the November election to reverse the policy of the government from protection to free trade or a tariff for revenue only, it was a foregone conclusion that this change would be made; and congress and the business world calmly awaited events. As President Harrison said in his message: "The friends of the protective system with undiminished confidence in the principles they have advocated, will await the results of the new experiment." He clearly prophesied the future when he said: "A general process of wage reduction cannot be contemplated by any patriotic citizen without the gravest apprehension." The message was received with almost universal approval by the Republicans.

The month of December passed quietly and rapidly. Practically nothing was done by congress and Mr. Dingley entered into the spirit of the holiday season with a portion of his family with him—wife, daughter and two sons. On the evening of the twenty-first he attended the annual banquet of the Congregational club on Forefather's day, responding briefly to a toast.

Congress reassembled January 4 and devoted the entire month of January to appropriation bills and a bill to repeal the silver act of 1890, or the so-called Sherman act. Mr. Cleveland intimated that he would favor only those who voted for the repeal bill; but the free silver faction openly declared that the bill would never come to a vote in the house. They kept good their word.

For more than two months, former Secretary Blaine had been confined to his house in Washington by illness. His condition was precarious and his family and friends realized that the great statesman was hovering between life and death. Public interest in his condition was manifest by the frequent inquiries made at his door.

The country knew that the "Plumed Knight" whose personality was brilliantly stamped on the history of his country, was nearing the end. The street in front of the old Seward mansion, facing Lafayette square was guarded; pedestrians on the other side bowed their heads solemnly. In the very room where Secretary of State William H. Seward was struck by a would-be assassin on that fateful night of April 14, 1865, James G. Blaine was breathing his last. That great heart and mind, that man who was the idol of thousands of Americans, was listening to the last summons. Seven days after former President Hayes was laid to his rest at Fremont, Ohio, January 27, Mr. Blaine passed away. The nation suffered a great loss and Mr. Dingley a personal bereavement. To "Mr. Blaine the statesman," Mr. Dingley paid this just and loving tribute:

"So far as we have noted, but one newspaper, and that mug-wampian, continues to regard Mr. Blaine as a failure. A judgment of men which exaggerates their shortcomings and underestimates their on-comings is not unusual; but, fortunately, it is unusual to find cynicism pursuing its professional prejudice to the very gates of death. Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, Webster, Clay, Calhoun, Tilden, and other eminent statesmen, had their bitter critics in life, but discriminating and kindly judgment in death. All had their faults, but the country today would be poorer had it been without great party leaders whose talents and virtues the world gladly and dutifully makes more conspicuous than those undisguised shortcomings which political complacency can see in others but which it is incapable of discovering where candor should be at home.

"We now see not at all, or but casually, the aristocratic spirit of Washington, the dogmatism of Hamilton, the compromises in the character of the statesman of the pro-slavery epoch. The angularity and apparent want of seriousness in Lincoln, satirized and burlesqued while he lived, now are seen to be the fascination and support of his life. We see the greatness of these heroes as we see Shakespeare's greatness even while he is violating the law or fooling with the gospel. There are always sides of failure in all great success, whether at Austerlitz or at Washington; but we believe that the judgment of future candor will pronounce James G. Blaine to be one of the few political geniuses of the American races in the nineteenth century.

"Mr. Blaine possessed not only fine forecast but fine creative gifts. He was the first public man in this country to divine the social secret of the southern question. He first philosophically an-

alyzed the grievance of American labor, which lies south of the Ohio river—tolerated, like the evils of the grog shop, simply because they seem to be in the order of nature. He was the first to discern the perils of importing low standards of life—the crux of the immigration question—and, as secretary of state, he made it the subject of a special investigation which was the basis of our present restrictive legislation. Long before the average mind had discovered the protective harmony possible between free trade and fair trade, Mr. Blaine threw his mighty influence for the measures which dovetail American protection with the development of our foreign commerce. The social and economic issues of the time, whether absolutely domestic or relatively international, Mr. Blaine forecasted with the prophetic insight which characterizes statesmanship and which prevents rather than arrests social disaster. They called him a Jingo, but in the office of secretary of state Mr. Blaine did as much for international courtesy as he did for international enterprise. It is perhaps not too much to say that in doing the work of half a dozen men as premier, he hastened the sad physical crisis through which he is now passing.

“Mr. Blaine was as cosmopolitan in his intellect as in his heart. His speeches were safely capable of transmission to cold type. They read well. His incisive english is the vehicle of ripe thought. Whether he wrote of ‘Twenty Years of Congress’ or helped to create *Twenty Years in Congress*, his genius shone as bright in what he said as in what he did. He had the horizons of history before him, whether he handled the pen or the voice of which he was master. His cyclopedic acquaintance with American politics and with the origins of our government, was not the result of cyclopedic labor, but the life of our history was in his fibre. Hence, when there were lances to be broken in debate, prodigies of intellectual grasp, of historic resources and of emotional fire were the normal consequence. A memory which was a phenomenon, ransacked the uttermost corners of all Anglo-Saxon politics for precedents and sought out universal man in universal history for illustration and citation. And, thus, this man seemed to be stored not only with apt recollections of the dead of the historic world, but with the ability to resuscitate and rally the world of yesterday to do battle for the world of today. None who have heard Blaine in the heat of debate, but have marveled at the wonderful balance maintained between the precision of his head and the fire of his heart. There is plenty of heat in the world and plenty of rendered reasons, but it is the man who can fuse without confusing, always impressing you

that, splendid as is his power, he has not found it necessary to bring out his reserves—that man is master of the situation in first being master of himself. When you can make men believe that success in debate, on the platform, in statesmanship, in diplomacy and in literature, is failure, then you can successfully write Blaine into oblivion.

"We are all failures in some respects. Mr. Blaine is a Titan and a man—and saying that is saying that he is not perfect, not all (we may safely assume) that he wanted to be, and, for that matter, none but the mugwumps of our degeneration, reach their ideals. But as for the dominant purpose of his life, Mr. Blaine is right. In his domestic, social and personal relationships the blue-fires of hostility found only what was wholesome. His large, magnanimous nature made him incapable of grudging. He neither harbored animosity nor anchored intolerance. He could see good even on the wrong side; he was thus able to put himself in the place of men dissentient in religion and in politics. Protestant or Catholic, he is large enough to see the man. He has the habit of conciliation, but this talent for peace is such as endows the greatest men for necessary war. He is a man of that unique quality of head and heart which never sulks in tents, which will go half way and, failing, will go yet a little further. To call such a life a failure, is to aggrandize the trifles and forget the man.

"We write these words not because we worship heroes, but because we recognize the fact that men are not alike and that there are giants in these days—men, like Gladstone and Blaine, who, for two generations in our time, have led great parliamentary battles and great popular movements,—men who in deed and in word reveal the genius of leadership, that rare co-ordination of sympathetic and intellectual forces, which expresses just what the people are groping for and just what they want tangibly embodied and effectively declared.

"And now, while this eminent leader of political thought and life in the last half of the nineteenth century, lies calmly waiting the summons of his Master to another life, we rejoice in the fact that while no life is ideal, death which is realization, blots out prejudice, misjudgment and party strife, and leaves the hero while removing the man."

Mr. Dingley also contributed an article¹ to the *New York Independent* of February 2, 1893, on his recollections and estimate of Mr. Blaine. Of this article the *Independent* said: "No article that

1—See Appendix.

will be written about Mr. Blaine will be read with more satisfaction than this interesting and valuable sketch from Mr. Dingley's practiced pen." ¹

The house began consideration of the legislative appropriation bill February 7. Mr. Dingley spoke ² in explanation of the bill and the appropriations made by the fifty-second congress. February 14 the pension appropriation bill was under discussion and Mr. Dingley addressed ³ the house on pension legislation. In speaking of the nation's duty to the soldiers he said: "The nation which has been saved by such devotion deserves to live no longer if it fails, not as an act of charity, but as an act of grateful recognition, aye, as an act of justice, to make good so far as pensions can do this, the impairment of limb, health, or vigor, which has been the direct or indirect result of service for the nation. And the measure of such pensions is very different in a nation like ours, which relies on its citizens to volunteer in the hour of need, from what it is in the case of a nation which maintains a large regular army for its defence."

The fight in the house over the pension bill was a part of the program laid down by Mr. Cleveland and his friends. It was proposed to transfer the pension bureau to the war department, to reduce the boards of surgeons to one member, to pay all pensioners from Washington, and to amend the act of 1890 so as to give no pensions to soldiers under the act unless entirely disabled from manual labor. Mr. Dingley successfully led the opposition to these assaults. This move on the part of the Cleveland Democrats against the old soldiers created an impression that the raid would be renewed at the next session. One thing that greatly weakened the attack at this time was the effective manner in which Mr. Dingley arraigned the southern leaders for denouncing the pensioning of union soldiers for disabilities not proven to have originated in the service, when every one of these southern men voted several years before to pension even more liberally, Mexican soldiers for exactly similar disabilities.

1—Walter Wellman, the Washington correspondent, wrote in November, 1896: "Mr. Dingley has been fortunate in his friendships. For more than a quarter of a century he and Mr. Blaine were near to one another. Mr. Blaine set so high an estimate upon the sagacity of Mr. Dingley that he never took an important step in politics or public life without first talking with the modest editor from Lewiston. Mr. Dingley was his mentor. Other men had the reputation of being nearer to him. They cared more for publicity. They loved more to bask in the sunshine of that splendid presence. But under the surface, in the background, was this well balanced, thoughtful, logical journalist and congressman, to whom Mr. Blaine always turned with his greatest perplexities and greatest secrets. 'Mr. Blaine was one of the greatest men the world ever knew,' says Gov. Dingley. 'He was a full man as Shakespeare put it.'"

2—See Appendix.

On the evening of February 14 he attended the annual dinner of the Washington alumni of Bowdoin college and made an address.

The closing days of the fifty-second congress were full of hard work by Mr. Dingley on the appropriation bills. He was up all night before the last day, and at noon on the fourth of March, witnessed with tired eyes and wearied brain, the inauguration of President Cleveland. A brilliant procession of forty thousand men marched through the snow and sleet; at the appointed hour the oath of office was administered to the new president and vice president; and the change of administration commanded by the people, began. The epoch upon which the country was now entering was important because of the gravity of the financial and economic problems to be solved in the face of changed political and industrial conditions.

President Cleveland's inaugural address advocated a sound and stable currency and said that "the verdict of the voters which condemned the injustice of maintaining protection for protection's sake, enjoins upon the people's servants the duty of exposing and destroying the most of the kindred evils which are the unwholesome progeny of paternalism." Referring to the decree of the people in favor of tariff reform, the president said: "Our task must be undertaken wisely and without vindictiveness. Our mission is not punishment but rectification of wrong."

Of President Cleveland's inaugural, Mr. Dingley said: "Mr. Cleveland's platform sweeps from the horizon all forms of protective legislation. Pensions, tariffs, reciprocity, liberal mail pay to shipping and all that, Mr. Cleveland thinks smacks of paternalism. He forgets that the great movement of modern legislation in Europe as well as in Australia and the new world, is towards economic justice—that is, toward the protection which he stigmatizes as paternalism. No student of modern society is blind to this movement; no observer of that society fails to see in that movement the emergency of a new science of political economy to which important legislation is fast becoming responsive. The old political economy is avoided in the advanced schools, and is notably being side-tracked by the tendencies even of English law. The old economists were sure of their facts and drew formidable conclusions therefrom—but they forgot man. Human nature is the overlooked factor of Mr. Cleveland's system of political thought. But human nature, which is but slowly modified, must ever be reckoned with, and when in fighting paternalism in government, a party forgets fraternalism as a factor in legislation as do Mr. Cleveland and his

followers in contesting the present economic policy of the Republican party, we beg to predict that before he runs his race he will encounter obstacles in the nature of things which at present he seems to be unable to foresee and unwilling to forebode."

Immediately after the adjournment of congress, Mr. Dingley in company with his wife, daughter and two sons, sailed for Europe. They departed from New York March 7, visiting many points in England, Scotland, France, Germany, Switzerland and Italy. This trip was taken entirely for his health. When in London Mr. Dingley, through the courtesy of Minister Lincoln, was enabled to hear the closing debates on the Home Rule bill in the house of commons. He wrote home his impressions of that debate as follows: "During the brief replies of ministers to inquiries, I had the opportunity of hearing Gladstone, who seemed but little older than he did when I heard him fourteen years ago—the most remarkable statesman of 84 years now living; Morley, who looks more like a dissenting minister than a prominent political leader; Asquith, who has a scholarly, classical face; Chamberlain, who is a born controversialist; and Balfour, who leads the Tories in the house, but does not impress me as a man of weight. * * * At five o'clock the speaker in a squeaking voice that could not have been heard ten feet in our huge and noisy house hall, announced that the home rule debate would be resumed.

"Thereupon Mr. William Sexton, the Irish leader, who had been selected to speak for the Irish Nationalists, was recognized and began a very interesting, eloquent and effective speech for home rule in Ireland. Sexton speaks like a member of our house—without hesitation, direct and in words enunciated with distinctness. This is in marked contrast with the hesitating, shuffling, incoherent style of speaking of most of the English members—Gladstone excepted. As Sexton proceeded he paid his respects to Balfour, and the Tory leader attempted to reply, but proved no match for Sexton. Then Sexton turned to Chamberlain and worsted him most effectually in a brief controversy. Sexton's tribute to Gladstone was most eloquent and touching and called forth a perfect storm of 'hear, hear,' (the English method of cheering) from the Irish members. Sexton spoke for two hours and the hall was crowded in every part with intent listeners.

"Gladstone paid Sexton strict attention, and seemed delighted with every word. Balfour sat with his hat drawn over his eyes (for in parliament members sit with their hats on), twisting from side to side as Sexton impaled him. Chamberlain stood it as long as he

could and then walked out. And yet Sexton's manner was as quiet as though he was telling a good story to his friends, his voice clear and conversational and his gestures few and simple. He is accounted one of the best speakers in the commons and this speech, which continued for two hours, and was received now with cheers and now with roars of laughter, fully sustained his reputation.

"As soon as Sexton concluded, the Tories put forward an Ulster member to reply, but his speech fell flat and emptied the house. Even Balfour could not stem the tide, although he pictured lugubriously the ruin that would follow (as he said) home rule, which is simply granting to Ireland the same measure of local rule in domestic matters that the people of each of our states have.

"After a recess of half an hour for dinner, the commons resumed, and John Morley summed up the case for the government. Morley is a very poor speaker, but nevertheless the matter of his speech was very able and effective.

"After a brief attack on home rule by Lord Randolph Churchill, whose reputation as a speaker is due to his rollicking and sensational manner; and a brief concluding speech by Gladstone, who always speaks ably and eloquently, the commons divided, and the home rule bill was passed to a second reading by 43 majority. The Irish members on the announcement of the result rose as one man and united in most tremendous cheers that fairly shook the old hall, while the Liberals generally were jubilant. The Tories or Unionists (as they now call themselves) sat in gloomy silence, merely pointing across the hall to the house of lords, which is expected to defeat the bill. It was the conclusion of a great debate of a great cause that is destined to become historical.

"There is one advantage that the house of commons has over our house, and this is that it sits in a much smaller hall with so small a body of visitors in the galleries that no confusion arises; and consequently the hall is quiet always and every speaker can be heard. It is only occasionally that our house becomes so quiet that every word can be distinctly heard. Ordinarily only a few members with stentorian voices can be heard in our representatives' hall—a fact which makes genuine debate much more rare than it should be."

He reached New York on his return from Europe July 22, and on the following Monday was once more at his home in Lewiston, refreshed and invigorated by his sojourn abroad. He secured a few days rest at his summer home where with his children and grandchildren he enjoyed the happiest moments of his life. August

4, four generations of Dingley's in the male line direct—great grandfather, grandfather, father and son—sat about the family board at this island home. It was a memorable day—one to which all the members of the family frequently referred. Mr. Dingley's father was 84 years old, vigorous in mind and body. By the blazing fire at this summer home the grandfather related to the family circle in his quaint and dry way, stories of his early experiences. His greatgrandson and greatgranddaughter, sat on his knees hours at a time listening to his inimitable tales. Oh the sweet memory of those happy days!

CHAPTER XIX.

1893-1895.

For three months succeeding the inauguration of President Cleveland March 4, 1893, the business of the country was demoralized. A money panic seized the financial world. Mills and factories were shut down and men thrown out of employment. Bank and commercial failures increased. So depressed was the iron and steel trade that every wire nail factory in the country shut down. The gold reserve declined, and the credit of the nation was impaired. Alarmed over the situation, President Cleveland called congress together in extra session August 7. Mr. Dingley left Maine for Washington August 5, arriving there the following day. He took his old rooms at the Hamilton house.

Monday, August 7, the fifty-third congress met in extraordinary session summoned by President Cleveland because "the distrust and apprehension concerning the financial situation, which pervade all business circles, have already caused great loss and damage to our people, and threatened to cripple our merchants, stop the wheels of manufacture, and bring distress and privation to our farmers and withhold from our workingmen the wage of labor." Mr. Crisp was elected speaker, receiving 214 votes to 122 for Mr. Reed and 7 for Mr. Simpson.

In this congress were many of the old leaders—Oates and Wheeler of Alabama; Crisp and Turner of Georgia; Hopkins, Springer and Cannon of Illinois; Holman, Johnson and Bynum of Indiana; Henderson, Lacey, Hepburn and Dolliver of Iowa; Reed, Dingley, Milliken and Boutelle of Maine; Burrows of Michigan; Catchings of Mississippi; Hatch, Dockery, DeArmond and Bland

of Missouri; Bryan of Nebraska; Fellows, Ray and Payne of New York; Johnson of North Dakota; Grosvenor and Outhwaite of Ohio; Bingham and Dalzell of Pennsylvania; McMillin and Richardson of Tennessee; Bailey and Sayers of Texas; Wilson of West Virginia; Babcock of Wisconsin. Among the new members who appeared in the house this session and who subsequently took prominent positions were: Cousins of Iowa, McCall of Massachusetts, Tawney and McCleary of Minnesota, Meiklejohn of Nebraska, McDowell of Pennsylvania and Swanson of Virginia.

Mr. Dingley was placed on the committees on appropriations, and coinage weights and measures.

President Cleveland's message charged the unfortunate plight of the nation "to congressional legislation touching the purchase and coinage of silver by the general government." This legislation known as the Sherman act, he considered "a truce after a long struggle between the advocates of free silver coinage and those intending to be more conservative." The president recommended the prompt repeal of the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, authorizing the purchase of silver bullion, "and that other legislative action may put beyond all doubt or mistake the intention and the ability of the government to fulfill its pecuniary obligations in money universally recognized by all civilized countries."

In commenting on the causes of the financial panic, Mr. Dingley said: "The difficulties which surround the silver question have arisen from the decline of silver from its old price of a dollar and twenty-nine cents an ounce to its present price of about seventy cents per ounce. In 1890 the free silver coinage sentiment revived with such force, and received such support from more than three-fourths of the Democrats, as made it probable that with the aid of a small body of Republican silver men, free coinage would be carried through the house, as it had been through the senate. In this situation, and to test the soundness of the view of the silver men that the use of the American product of silver as money would bring silver to par with gold, the Republicans, who then had a small majority in the two houses, passed a bill repealing the act of 1878 and providing for the purchase at market rates of four and one half million ounces of silver per month—substantially the American product—and the issue of legal tender treasury notes for the payment of the same. The failure of the international silver conference of last winter (1892-3) and the act of 1890, caused a further decline in the price of silver and still the treasury was obliged to buy silver. But there would have been no trouble from silver pur-

chases this year, if the Democratic majority in congress and Secretary Carlisle had not refused to take measures to protect our gold reserve. Before congress adjourned it was evident that the demand for gold in Europe would lead to calls on our reserve, which would be liable to cause distrust of our ability and disposition to maintain the parity of our currency with gold unless measures were taken to assure the country and the world that we proposed to keep up the hundred million gold reserve. Accordingly, after consultation with Secretary Carlisle, who, it was known, was to be secretary of the treasury, after March 4, Mr. Sherman introduced and secured the adoption by the senate of an amendment to the sundry civil bill authorizing the secretary to sell bonds to purchase gold to maintain the redemption fund. Mr. Sherman and others believed that the resumption act of 1875 already authorized this, but he thought that a new declaration by congress would have a great moral effect abroad as well as here in maintaining confidence, and would probably render it unnecessary to sell any bonds for this purpose. The bill as amended went back to the house, when Bland led off in a fierce assault on this amendment, accompanied with a declaration that silver redemption was sufficient. His assault frightened Carlisle, and at his request the amendment was dropped, and the foundation laid for the monetary distrust which showed itself soon after, and began to add to the industrial difficulties by threatened tariff legislation. Even then, when the gold redemption fund fell below the hundred million limit, and a monetary panic was threatened, if Secretary Carlisle had promptly taken advantage of the act of 1875, and announced that the treasury would sell bonds if necessary to protect the gold reserve and maintain the parity of all our currency with gold, the distrust of our currency would speedily have disappeared. But instead of that, Secretary Carlisle hesitated, and soon announced that no bonds would be issued; and in an interview even intimated that silver redemption might be resorted to. This let loose the monetary storm to add new disturbances to our business already seriously crippled by threatened hostile tariff legislation, and made the distrust of the future complete, when all that was wanted was such action as would strengthen rather than weaken confidence."

It is now conceded that the political causes of the financial and industrial crisis of 1893 were the menace of free silver coinage and a low tariff policy. The manifest remedy was, first, currency reform, second, a continuance of the protective policy. The first was comparatively easy to accomplish because it was known that President

Cleveland would veto any free silver coinage bill; but the second was not so easy to accomplish, for the president was a pronounced free trader and the protection Democrats were few. In reply to the query, "how shall the country get out of its present straits?" Mr. Dingley said: "First, repeal the silver purchase clause, second, resolve to let the tariff alone."

The proposition to repeal the purchase clause of the act of 1890 caused intense bitterness among the free silver Democrats; and when on the 11th of August the debate began on the bill, there were prospects of a stormy time. Not since the anti-slavery days was there ever in the house such a conflict based on greed. The temperance of the language used by the free silver coinage leaders resembled that employed by the southern leaders in 1860. The silver men on the floor were re-inforced by a strong lobby. It was a battle royal, and the whole business world was alarmed. The nation was daily paying dearly for these financial heresies. An aggressive campaign of education was needed.

Mr. Dingley was one of the men put forward by the sound money forces to stem the tide of free silver that threatened to defeat the bill before the house and substitute a still more dangerous measure embodying the free coinage of silver. He addressed ¹ the house at this critical juncture August 24. He talked for half an hour, entirely consuming his time whereupon Mr. Hulick of Ohio said: "Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the time of the gentleman be continued indefinitely so that the words of wisdom he is giving us can be heard by every member of the house." And his time was extended indefinitely. In forcible language he discussed the silver question, treating it historically, scientifically and practically. The house gave him the closest attention conceding that his utterances were the fruit of years of careful study, reflection and experience. The subject was handled by a master who knew what he was talking about. Nobody even questioned his statements. And when in closing he said, "Let me indulge the hope, Mr. Speaker, that whatever congress may do, it will first take care to make every dollar as good as gold; and second, that not a dollar will be allowed to be issued by authority of any state, but all shall be issued under one uniform system and under the authority and control of the nation"—there was loud applause and manifestations of approval. It was a splendid effort. This speech was also used as a campaign document.

1—See Appendix.

The house was crowded to the corridors and the lobbies August 28, when the final vote on the repealing bill was taken. Bland of Missouri fought desperately for the free coinage of silver at any ratio from 16 to 1 to 20 to 1, offering five different amendments to that effect, and finally offering the Bland-Allison act of 1878 as an amendment. But all amendments were voted down and the bill repealing the purchase clause of the act of 1890 passed by a vote of 239 to 108. The announcement of the result was greeted with applause on the floor and in the galleries. Thus President Cleveland scored his first point against his free silver party associates.

Mr. Dingley took this opportunity, while the repealing bill was in the senate, to seek a week's rest at his home in Lewiston. September 12 he was again at his post in Washington. Finding that the silver discussion was likely to continue in the senate for some time, Mr. Dingley started for Chicago September 16 where he joined his wife and three children. Here they visited the World's Fair, receiving much attention from the officials. He returned to Washington September 24 and found the house doing nothing. For two months the senate debated the silver purchase act. The advocates of free silver coinage sought to teach President Cleveland that his word was not law in the senate; and to that end offered a compromise bill which the house would not pass and which the president would not sign. A deadlock held the senate in a state of inactivity and thwarted the will of the majority. But on the thirtieth of October the repealing bill finally passed by a vote of 43 to 32. On the first day of November the house agreed to the senate amendments and the bill was passed. It went to the president and was immediately signed by him. Thus President Cleveland triumphed over the silver Democrats. It was a hard earned victory and widened the breach in the Democratic party.

October 30 Mr. Dingley made an able address¹ in the house on bankruptcy legislation. Congress adjourned November 3 and the business world breathed easier. November 7 Mr. Dingley reached his home in Maine where he rested for three weeks.

The Republican victories in Massachusetts, Iowa, New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio reassured the party that the people were ready for the restoration of the party of protection. Mr. McKinley's election to the office of governor of Ohio, was a distinct indication of a change to the policy of protection which the Democrats nicknamed "McKinleyism." Of this significant result Mr. Dingley said: "To Maj. McKinley the victory comes as a personal indorse-

1—See Appendix.

ment which puts him more prominently than ever before the Republicans of the country as one of the leaders from whom is to come the next Republican nominee for the presidency."

November 23 Mr. Dingley returned to Washington. Here he spent Thanksgiving day with his wife and two sons.

President Cleveland's message was read in the house December 4. This document defended the course of "special commissioner" Blount in Hawaii, urging congress to "resolutely turn away from alluring and temporary expedients, determined to be content with nothing less than a lasting and comprehensive financial plan." The president reiterated his pension policy saying that: "Thousands of neighborhoods have their well known fraudulent pensioners." The president urged upon congress strict economy because "a depleted treasury confronts us, and many of our people are engaged in a hard struggle for the necessities of life."

The attitude of the president and Commissioner of Pensions Lochren, on the question of pensions, incensed the old soldiers throughout the land. The charges of fraud in the pension rolls was a serious reflection upon previous administrations. Accordingly when the commissioner appeared before the appropriation committee asking for an increase from \$200,000 to \$500,000 in the appropriation for the expenses of pension examiners in the field, Mr. Dingley, a member of the committee, questioned the commissioner closely, bringing out the fact that the commissioner disclaimed the belief that there were wholesale and gigantic frauds in the pension rolls. December 18 when the pension provisions of the deficiency appropriation bill were in the house, Mr. Dingley spoke ¹ at some length. He defended the acts of previous administrations and objected to the wholesale charges of fraud that were being made as contrary to fact.

When President Cleveland entered upon his duties, the senate had under consideration a treaty providing for the annexation of the Hawaiian islands to the territory of the United States. The president thought that great importance attached to this particular treaty of annexation "because it contemplated a departure from unbroken American tradition in providing for the addition to our territory of islands of the sea more than two thousand miles removed from our nearest coast." The president was suspicious of the treaty and withdrew it from the senate for examination. He sent James H. Blount of Georgia, a former member of congress, to Hawaii to investigate the matter. The latter reported in substance

1—See Appendix.

that the Hawaiian resolution of the previous January could not have been successful if United States Minister Stevens had not aided it. He recommended that the islands be turned back to the monarchy which existed "before the lawless landing of the United States forces at Honolulu," as the president said in his message of December 18.

Mr. Dingley said: "The real question is whether or not this government shall now, after it and all other nations have for months recognized the provisional government, withdraw this recognition and attempt either by word or physical power to restore the ex-queen to her throne. It is certainly most astonishing that an American administration should have busied itself in trying to discredit the public acts of an American minister which looked to the strengthening of the influence of this government in the Pacific, when no foreign power—not even Great Britain, which has for years sought to obtain a foothold in the Sandwich islands, and which would have been the first to remonstrate if we had overstepped the proper limits—has ever uttered a word of complaint."

The Hawaiian message of December 18 was a remarkable document. It charged the previous administration and its representatives with wrong doing and misrepresentation. It advised congress that the treaty of annexation would not be sent back to the senate. It arrogated to the president a degree of executive power not contemplated hitherto. It antagonized both the senate and the house. Said Mr. Dingley: "The message presented the Hawaiian matter in a more astonishing situation than was supposed. By what authority the president without the authority of congress sent an agent not confirmed by the same, to Hawaii, accredited to a government recognized by the United States, to endeavor to induce a subject of that government, to-wit, the ex-queen, to set up a rebellious government which in itself was practically an act of war on that recognized government, I should like to have some explanation."

On the 21st of December congress adjourned to January 3. Mr. Dingley remained in Washington during the entire holiday recess, devoting the most of his time to the preparation of speeches. On the night of December 23 the Hamilton house was discovered on fire. Mr. Dingley and his wife were on the point of retiring and escaped from the building with difficulty. They hurried across Fourteenth street and secured rooms for the night at the Cochran hotel. It was a narrow escape for them both.

The Democratic members of the committee on ways and means, for months previous had been preparing "a tariff reform" bill along the lines laid down in the Democratic platform and in President Cleveland's message. The minority report, prepared by Mr. Reed, called the measure "another tariff-tinkering bill, the like of which has disturbed the conditions of business so many times in the last thirty years." The business interests took alarm when the first draft of the Wilson bill was made public. Petitions from workingmen against the passage of the bill were sent to the members of the ways and means committee. But the work of tariff reform progressed; and on the 8th of January Chairman Wilson of the ways and means committee, opened the debate on the tariff bill "to reduce taxation and to provide revenue for the government and for other purposes." January 11 Mr. Dingley addressed ¹ the house at some length on the threatened tariff revolution. His speech was able and exhaustive. It was the result of years of study and weeks of careful preparation. He predicted the loss of seventy-six million dollars in revenue, the loss of our home markets and the loss of wages. He pointed out the danger attending the Democratic free trade theories and warned the nation that a period of depression would follow the enactment into law of any such measure. Loud applause greeted him as he closed. It was a speech that added still more to his reputation as a tariff authority. January 17 he spoke ¹ briefly in reply to Mr. Cockran of New York, taking for his special text the free trade theory that we should give up the manufacture in this country of all articles that can be manufactured cheaper abroad. He completely demolished this theory. His pivotal point which elicited enthusiastic applause from the Republican side of the house was that "if two hundred millions of goods that can be and should be made in this country, are bought in Europe, such imports deprive American manufacturers of the sale of that amount of goods and stop work just to that extent." On the 18th of January, he spoke ¹ briefly on "Free Wool," exposing the inconsistencies of the Democratic contentions. Mr. Dingley fought ¹ hard against the proposition to place lime on the free list. He argued that American labor received the benefit of a protective duty on lime. Mr. Bryan of Nebraska, who was put forward to reply to Mr. Dingley, said that this country ought not to manufacture lime or anything else if it could be made cheaper in Canada. On the 22nd of January he spoke ¹ briefly on the sugar schedule of the tariff bill. January 25 he spoke ¹ briefly, warning the Democratic party that

¹—See Appendix.

when it completed the work of destroying American industries, it would hear from the country in a way that could not be misunderstood.

After nearly four weeks of debate, on the first day of February, the Wilson tariff bill with an income tax amendment, passed the house by a vote of 204 to 140. Mr. Reed closed the debate for the Republicans; making a masterly speech. Chairman Wilson closed the debate for the Democrats. He secured a great ovation from his party associates. Cheer after cheer rang out, men threw hats and papers in the air and women waved their handkerchiefs. Wilson was seized by his admirers and carried out on their shoulders to the committee room. Thus the mischievous Wilson tariff bill passed the house.

Mr. Dingley's chief objection to the Wilson bill was the fact that under the cloak of "free raw materials," the bill in the main placed northern products on the free list and southern products on the protected list.

Throughout this exciting debate Mr. Dingley was a master hand. Although not a member of the ways and means committee, he acquired a wide reputation in tariff matters by his service on the committee that framed the McKinley tariff of 1890, and was this year one of the leading Republican speakers in opposition to the Wilson bill. His strength was in general debate, in which he was conspicuous on account of his familiarity with public questions.¹

A thorough knowledge of parliamentary law and the rules of the house is necessary to carry through any measure that is skillfully opposed. Mr. Dingley, through long experience, possessed this knowledge and was able to display his skill during the long fight over the tariff bill. A most interesting parliamentary battle took place in the committee of the whole, while the tariff bill was under

1—In speaking of Mr. Dingley a Washington correspondent wrote: "He is full of statistics, logical and convincing; and is one of the few members who do not fear interruptions and unexpected questions, when speaking. He is spoken of as a constructive legislator, and is the author of numerous laws on the statute books. No one in the house watches the business more closely or exercises more influence. Former Governor Long recently said of Mr. Dingley: 'He is the best posted man in the house on tariff, financial and shipping subjects, and is regarded as authority by both sides in these matters.' Mr. Dockery, one of the leading Democrats in the house, said: 'Mr. Dingley is the best legislator in the house.'"

1—The New York Sun's Washington correspondent speaking of the tariff debate said: "Gov. Dingley of Maine is the one upon whom, when it comes to a question of fact, the Republican main reliance rests. Mr. Dingley knows the tariff question. Many persons think that he is the best informed man in the house on that subject. When he argues he cites an array of facts and figures that is staggering to his opponents. The Democrats realize that it is dangerous to trifle with him. Mr. Dingley never wastes any time. When he is not talking himself, or watching for his opponents to make an error of statement, he is writing or reading up on tariff matters."

discussion. It was over the proposition of the committee on ways and means to extend the bonded period for the payment of the internal revenue tax on whiskey, from three years to eight years. The whiskey syndicate was represented by a strong lobby. Mr. Dingley took charge of those opposed to the bonded period, and led in the fight. After a sharp parliamentary struggle to get recognition for offering amendments, Mr. Dingley was recognized to offer his amendment to strike out the eight years extension provided by the bill, and leave the bonded period three years. After a spirited discussion, during which Mr. Dingley warded off a large number of amendments, and held the committee to his one motion, a vote was taken, and greatly to the surprise of the whiskey syndicate, Mr. Dingley's amendment was carried by 25 majority on a vote by tellers. Immediately there was a most vigorous fight opened on amendments by indirection to overcome the effect of Mr. Dingley's amendment already adopted. For over an hour the contest waged on points of order made by Mr. Dingley against every variety of amendment offered. It was a hard struggle and the chairman of the committee sustained every point made by Mr. Dingley, until finally the whiskey syndicate gave up in despair, and the victory was won so far as the house was concerned.

Debate on the Hawaiian resolution censuring the United States minister for "aiding in overthrowing the constitutional government of the Hawaiian islands" was resumed in the house February 6. The resolution was fiercely assailed, and on the following day was adopted by the house by a narrow margin. The exciting incident attending this debate was the attack made on President Cleveland by Mr. Sickles, a Democratic member from New York.

For nearly a month Mr. Dingley was confined to his rooms by a severe cold and bronchial affection. March 1 he was well enough to resume his seat in the house and to vote against the Bland seigniorage bill. For a long time the Democratic leaders were unable to secure a quorum and it was seriously contemplated to adopt the Reed method of counting a quorum. However, enough votes were finally summoned, and the bill, called by its opponents, "A bill to coin a vacuum," passed the house by a vote of 168 to 129. This bill passed the senate but was vetoed by the president. An attempt in the house to pass the bill over the president's veto failed—yeas 144, nays 114, not voting 94. The necessary two-thirds could not be summoned.

The veto of the seigniorage bill by President Cleveland was expected, because a failure to veto it would have been in conflict with

his good record on the question of sound money. President Cleveland deserves great credit for following his convictions rather than politics. Mr. Dingley said: "The fact is this coinage of the seigniorage as proposed, would be as dishonest as unwise. The Sherman law expressly forbids the issue of any notes or silver dollars in excess of the cost of the silver bullion. Hence to issue notes or dollars that are not backed by bullion costing an equivalent, is to violate the contract and command of law as well as to violate honest finance. To coin the difference between the value of the bullion and the 47 cent dollar token, is pure fiatism. What would Jefferson and Hamilton say to the proposal that the United States government having lost an enormous sum of money by buying silver bullion on a falling market, and issuing notes against that bullion to the extent of the cost of such white metal, should proceed to issue 47 cent dollar tokens to the extent of its loss in the transaction, on the ground that by an act of the imagination this loss could be labeled 'seigniorage.' There was never so little in a name. Seigniorage is not the profit on token currency, otherwise we might issue paper money and regard the difference between the cost of paper and printing and the denomination of the note, as so much profit. When you can make a crowbar a toothpick by calling it a toothpick, then you may find reasons for coining a vacuum."

April 5 Mr. Dingley spoke ¹ in reply to Mr. Holman of Indiana on the appropriations of the fifty-first and fifty-second congresses. In the course of his remarks he paid a high compliment to Mr. Sayers, the chairman of the appropriations committee, who, he said, had not repeated the discreditable practice of playing politics with appropriation bills.

Sometime previous, a commission consisting of Senators Cockrell, Jones and Cullom and Representatives Dockery, Richardson and Dingley, was appointed to examine the laws of the executive departments, with a view of improving the methods of public business. The commission reported March 29. Mr. Dingley offered a most comprehensive and important bill. He met all objections urged against it, and demonstrated not only its practicability but the necessity of its adoption. Under his plan the government would save \$200,000 a year by dispensing with 150 clerks and abolishing several offices. This bill passed the house May 2, after a short speech ¹ of explanation by Mr. Dingley.

¹—See Appendix.

The Democratic majority in the house, was now convinced, after several days of filibustering, that it was impossible to do business unless the members could be compelled to be present and vote. On the eleventh of April, a rule was introduced to fine absent and non-voting members. This was scornfully rejected, whereupon on the seventeenth of the month a complete surrender was made to the Reed method of counting a quorum, so bitterly denounced by the Democrats in the fifty-first congress. The new rule permitting the counting of a quorum was adopted by a vote of 213 to 47,—93 not voting. Most of the Republicans voted for the rule amid great applause.

April 19, while the consular and diplomatic bill was under discussion, Mr. Dingley spoke ¹ on the Hawaiian matter, defending the course of Former Minister Stevens, "a distinguished citizen of Maine."

About this time the story was circulated that Mr. Dingley would be a candidate for United States senator against Senator Frye. Mr. Dingley said: "The suggestion or intimation is a pure invention. It is the duty and privilege of Maine to retain Senator Frye in the position which he fills with such ability and acceptance. I will not permit the use of my name against him."

April 27 Mr. Dingley spoke ¹ against the bill to relieve the heirs of one Dr. Nathan Fletcher for cotton said to have been taken during the civil war. He maintained that these cotton claims ought not to be given recognition by congress.

On the first day of May the number of unemployed in the several states was larger than ever known. There was a widespread wave of discontent. Coxey's army, an aggregation of three hundred ragged, footsore commonwealers headed by one Coxey from Massillon, Ohio, marched to Washington and attempted to take possession of the capitol grounds. The spectacle of Coxeyism from any standpoint, was a national humiliation. It was the natural outgrowth of the policy which was being fostered by the party in power.

The legislative appropriation bill precipitated several sharp discussions relative to the accuracy of the report sent out by the agricultural department in the farmers' bulletins; the appropriations made by Republican and Democratic congresses; and the civil service. Mr. Dingley took an active part in this debate; and on May

1—See Appendix.

24, the bill passed, the attempt to cut out the appropriation for the civil service happily failing.

June 5, Mr. Dingley for the seventh time was unanimously re-nominated for representative in congress by the Republicans of the second Maine district. The resolutions tendered to Mr. Dingley "our thanks for the marked fidelity and ability with which he has represented this district in the national house of representatives and especially for the great zeal, persistence and ability with which he has resisted the wanton attacks upon the industries of our country by the Democratic tariff revisers in the present congress."

May 26 debate on the bill to suspend the operation of the laws imposing a tax of ten per cent on notes issued by state banks, began. Discussion continued until June 6, when Mr. Dingley closed the debate ¹ speaking against the measure. He discussed the function of banks in modern business, the objection to banks of issue, and the importance of having a national circulating medium. He disposed of the "centralization" and "monopoly" charge and defended ably the national bank system. He was warmly congratulated upon his effort. The bill was defeated.

June 6 the members of his family in Washington left for Maine, leaving Mr. Dingley "lonesome and forlorn" as he wrote in his diary. A week later he received word that one of his sons was dangerously ill in Lewiston. He dropped all public business and hurried to the bedside of the sick one. His fears were well founded, and he saw his boy dangerously ill with pneumonia. While weighed down with anxiety and watching at the bedside of his boy, he received a letter, June 16, from President Tucker of Dartmouth college that the degree of LL. D. would be conferred on him at the approaching commencement. For three days the anxious parents watched at the bedside of their loved one. The best of medical skill was employed and on the twentieth, Mr. Dingley recorded in his diary: "The case is grave and against him, yet there are some chances of recovery. We are greatly shocked and cannot seem to have it so. But we keep courage and hope for the best, as there are some chances of our dear boy's recovery. Our prayers go up for his recovery!" The prayers were heard; the crisis was passed and the son showed signs of rallying. The improvement was so great that on the 25th of June Mr. Dingley left for Dartmouth college. The following day he delivered the alumni oration on "The Scholar and Politics." ¹ He was warmly congratulated. On the following day he received the honorary degree of LL. D.

1—See Appendix.

The succeeding six weeks were full of mingled pleasure and anxiety for Mr. Dingley. His sick son recovered all too slowly; and father and son went to Rangely lakes to rest and recuperate. It was not until August 8 that he resumed his seat in the house.

From the first of February to the first of May the Democratic members of the senate finance committee struggled with the Wilson tariff bill, reporting it first, with certain changes, and modifying it subsequently from time to time to secure the votes of Democratic senators who refused to support the bill as it passed the house. Sugar was taken from the free list and made dutiable to secure the votes of the two Louisiana senators. Coal and iron ore were taken from the free list and made dutiable to secure the votes of others. Finally, on the night of July 3, the "tariff reform" bill passed the senate. The bill had a stormy time in the upper house. It was charged that the sugar trust was manipulating the sugar schedule and that certain senators were speculating on the side. An investigating committee was appointed but, as is usual in such cases, reported that there was no proof to sustain the charges.

The conferees on the tariff bill struggled for days with the measure but were unable to agree. Vexed with the hopeless condition of affairs, President Cleveland took a hand in the contest. The chief executive had on the second of July addressed a letter to Chairman Wilson of the house ways and means committee, criticising severely the course of certain Democratic senators. This letter was read in the house July 19. In it the president said that "every true Democrat and sincere tariff reformer knows that the tariff bill in its present form and as it will be submitted to the conferees, falls far short of the consummation for which we have long labored. Our abandonment of the cause of the principles upon which it rests, means party perfidy and dishonor." He urged that "no tariff measure can accord with Democratic principles and promises, or bear a genuine Democratic badge that does not provide for free raw materials. Unfortunately, however, incidents have accompanied certain stages of the legislation, that have aroused in connection with this subject a natural Democratic animosity to the methods and manipulations of trusts and combinations."

This letter was a bombshell in the Democratic ranks. It was the first time in the nation's history when the chief executive had attempted by a private communication, amounting to a message, to interfere when differences between the two houses were in conference. This remarkable executive interference with legislation was

followed by an inevitable storm. The president's letter was a covert attack on Senator Gorman, who was charged with placing coal and iron on the protected list, in violation of the Democratic "free raw material" argument. The storm broke in the senate July 23. Mr. Gorman made a scorching and personal reply to the president, characterizing the latter's letter to Chairman Wilson as "the most unwise letter ever penned by a president of the United States." Senator Gorman threw down the gauntlet to the president and insinuated that the latter was trying to blacken the character of the senators. "There is no power," he shouted, "however great in the president with all his patronage that would keep me silent longer." The scene was dramatic in the extreme, and Mr. Gorman closed amid great applause on the floor and in the galleries—an unusual scene in the senate.

After another long delay in conference, the senate tariff bill, characterized by President Cleveland "a measure of perfidy and dishonor," passed the house by a vote of 160 Democrats, 81 Republicans and 21 Democrats opposing. The debate on this closing day was interesting. Mr. Dingley spoke ¹ vigorously and prophetically against the bill. He compared the tariff of 1890 with the measure now proposed and pointed out where trusts were favored particularly the sugar and whiskey trusts. He closed with these words: "The distrust caused by the Democratic threats of a tariff revolution has produced its bitter fruits, and the end is not yet." He predicted that in 1896, by general consent, the Republicans would resume the business of governing the country. This speech was used liberally as a campaign document in the succeeding congressional election.

President Cleveland refused to sign or veto the tariff reform bill. He simply allowed it to become a law by default.

August 16 Mr. Dingley spoke ¹ on the conference report on the deficiency appropriation bill, calling public attention to the bad condition of the nation's finances. On the evening of the same day he left Washington, and a week later plunged into the state campaign in Maine. He spoke nearly every day until election day, September 10. The Republicans carried the state by 38,000 plurality. Mr. Dingley had 9,000 plurality. The election over, he spent some time hunting and fishing with one of his sons who was endeavoring to regain his health in the pine woods about Rangely lakes. November 6, elections were held in 41 states. The Republi-

1—See Appendix.

cans swept the north and Mr. Dingley said: "The result of the November elections has settled beyond question that there will be no more tariff legislation in the direction of free trade. It is difficult, however, to appreciate the permanent loss to the country arising from the reduction of wages due to Democratic tariff changes which increase foreign competition."

The remaining days of November were days of comparative rest for this busy man. On the fifteenth a family reunion was held at his home to commemorate the 85th birthday of his father. November 26, in company with his wife and one son, he returned to Washington to again resume his official labors.

The closing session of the fifty-third congress opened December 3. The president's message told of the deficit in the public treasury; the rapid reduction of the gold reserve; the danger of reducing the country to a silver basis; and the disappointment the Wilson tariff bill had caused. The message was disheartening to the Democrats and they were not slow to express their sentiments. It was apparent to observers of political events, that the wave of tariff reform had reached its height, and was rapidly receding. The Democratic leaders realized that the great principle of protection of which the McKinley law at the date of its passage was the most scientific and well rounded expression ever imbedded in our statutes, had been reaffirmed by the American people out of a costly experience. Bewildered over the tariff, President Cleveland sought to regain his lost prestige by enjoining the Democratic congress to "reform the currency." But here the executive was confronted with perplexities no less than those surrounding the tariff. He, a gold Democrat, sought to force a free silver congress to do his bidding. The failure that followed was inevitable. Mr. Dingley said of the situation: "There is now special need of a calm and philosophic temper as well as of a sound financial intelligence in addressing currency questions. The present policy of borrowing to live on, may be Democratic but it is suicidal."

The Democratic plan of "currency reform" involved a repeal of the tax on state bank notes; and on the 18th of December a bill providing for such repeal was called up in the house.

Mr. Dingley, together with his wife and one son, spent the holidays at Southern Pines, North Carolina, for the benefit of the son's health. Here he spent Christmas and New Year's, returning alone to Washington on the third of January.

The debate on the currency bill was resumed as soon as congress reassembled; and on the fourth of January Mr. Dingley made his great speech¹ on the currency question, so freely quoted at the time. It was considered one of the ablest speeches on the subject ever delivered in the house. It explained the deficiency in the public treasury; the run on the redemption fund; the danger of a state bank currency. Mr. Dingley himself modestly pronounced it "a successful speech." This speech was a forerunner of his great fight for sound money. Of it the New York Tribune said: "The speech of Mr. Dingley was one of the ablest and most convincing that he has ever delivered on the financial subject in the house of representatives, and that is saying a great deal, for he is regarded on all sides as one of the soundest and best equipped men in that body."

The financial bill was defeated February 7 by a vote of 135 to 162.


The columns of the Lewiston Journal this winter, teemed with strong editorials on the money question, all from the pen of Mr. Dingley. They gave evidence of mature thought and ripe judgment. As an illumination of the money question they are unexcelled.

For years the Alaskan seal fisheries had been a question disturbing the relations between Great Britain and the United States. The Paris regulations for the protection of the seals had been a flat failure. They were a failure because, notwithstanding the cessation for three years of the killing of the seals by the lessees of the government, the Canadian pelagic sealers had killed twice as many as before. "If this work of extermination goes on," said Mr. Dingley, "in less than five years the seal herd will be exterminated and a property worth ten million dollars will fall into the hands of the pelagic sealers, mainly Canadians. We are, in the mean time, protecting these seals at an expense of over \$200,000 per year for the benefit of the Canadians. One of two things must be done: first, Great Britain must be made acquainted with the facts as they exist, and she must be asked immediately to unite with this country in making such regulation as will protect this seal herd; second, some radical remedy must be applied." Mr. Dingley then sent to the clerk's desk a bill authorizing the secretary of the treasury to proceed at once to capture all fur bearing seals and convert the money received from the sale of the skins into the treasury. The bill was referred to the ways and means committee, and received much favorable comment.

1—See Appendix.



W. J. BRYAN. JERRY SIMPSON.
W. P. HEPBURN. C. A. RUSSELL.



January 25 Mr. Dingley spoke ¹ on the proviso of the sundry civil appropriation bill relative to denominations of notes. January 29 he replied ¹ to Mr. Wilson's roseate view of the financial condition of the country and pointed out the necessity of raising more revenue. He closed by saying: "As men deeply interested in the prosperity of this country, as men placing country above party, we have stood ready to unite with you in any steps that might in our judgment, tend to restore confidence, remove the prevailing distrust, and give to this country the great prosperity which existed under Republican policy from 1861 to 1892."

The financial world was still disturbed. The "endless chain" and the increasing deficit in the federal treasury alarmed President Cleveland, so that announcement was made of an issue of United States bonds to restore the gold reserve. Congress refused to permit the bonds to be payable in gold instead of "in coin," thus increasing the rate of interest from 3 to 4 per cent. The bill authorizing the president to issue \$65,116,275 in 3 per cent gold bonds, was, on the fourteenth of February, after a heated discussion, defeated by a vote of 167 to 120, two not voting. The result was greeted with loud applause.

February 12 Mr. Dingley attended a Republican club banquet at Delmonico's in New York city and responded to the toast, "The Republican Party." February 21 eulogies were pronounced in the house on the life and services of Francis B. Stockbridge, late United States senator from Michigan. Mr. Dingley spoke ¹ briefly but feelingly.

It was already evident that the proposition to admit silver to free coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1 would be the battle cry of the Democrats in the approaching presidential contest. In the closing hours of this congress the leading Democrats in the house sounded the keynote. Mr. Bryan of Nebraska, shortly before the fifty-third congress closed, made a dramatic and impassioned speech in which, taking the proposed international monetary conference as a text, he appealed to the American people to restore silver to free and unlimited coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1 "without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation." Mr. Dingley made a very pointed and significant reply ¹ to Mr. Bryan which was indorsed by a large majority of the Republicans and many Democrats, and which sounded the keynote of the defense the advocates of sound money subsequently made in the campaign of 1896.

¹—See Appendix.

The fifty-third congress came to an end at noon March 4, 1895. That evening Mr. Dingley, in company with his daughter, left Washington for Southern Pines, North Carolina, to join his wife and son. Here he spent five weeks with a portion of his family, resting, riding horseback and roaming through the woods. This sojourn in the southern clime was for the benefit of his invalid son; but likewise it was a great benefit to the father. But a quiet and bucolic atmosphere did not put an end to Mr. Dingley's work. His active and creative mind was busy preparing a novel presentation of the silver question. About this time, a small, yellow covered book known as "Coin's Financial School" by William H. Harvey, was being circulated and read freely all over the country. It was a unique presentation of the silver question from the 16 to 1 free silver point of view, and exerted a great influence in the several states, particularly in the west. It was read on the trains, in the hotels, on the farm, and in the shop. It was a campaign document in elections, and was to many homes a sort of bible. Men suffering from the hard times examined it eagerly and accepted its doctrines as law and gospel. Mr. Dingley secured a copy of this book and quickly detected its fallacies and falsehoods; and forthwith began to write a series of questions and answers on the silver question. In this imaginary conversation, he covered the money problem in an elementary manner so that all might understand it. Returning to his home in Maine April 20, he revised this series of articles, and had them published in pamphlet form under the heading—"Three Evenings with Silver and Money; the Talk of Four Neighbors About Money and Silver."¹

This little pamphlet prepared by Mr. Dingley is of historical value. Sometime in June, 1896, before the national convention met at St. Louis, Chairman Babcock of the congressional committee came across a pamphlet called "Three Evenings with Silver and Money." The pamphlet contained something like sixty pages, ordinary size, and purported to be the arguments and discussions of four neighbors on the general question of silver, gold, protection and free trade. Mr. Babcock said that General Henderson of Iowa had handed it to him and informed him that it was a most valuable document and that he, (Henderson) wished Mr. Babcock to have at least fifty thousand copies of it printed for use in Henderson's district. Mr. Babcock found it to be one of the most valuable political documents ever put out. It discussed in plain and

1—See Appendix.

homely terms the arguments of the plain people as to the money supplies, sorts of money needed, the effects of free silver, of the gold standard, the protection and development of a country which resulted from confidence in a stable monetary system, and of protection in favor of our farmer and workingman as against those of the rest of the world. The Republican national committee had not yet met and the issues had not been stated, yet a reading of this pamphlet satisfied the committee that it was, in all ways, a very necessary document. It was noticed that it was printed at the office of the Lewiston (Maine) Journal in 1895. This was the only hint as to the authorship. Before it was ready for publication congress had adjourned but, fortunately, a resolution had been passed on motion of Congressman Babcock, giving a general leave to print, good for ten days after the adjournment. As a result, the Congressional Record for June 25, 1896, included these remarks by Hon. Joseph W. Babcock: "Mr. Speaker, under the leave which has been granted by the house I desire to make some practical observations on silver and money, and especially on the proposition that the United States should open its mints to the gratuitous and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. And in doing this I can best express my views in a simple and easily understood manner by adopting as my own, a conversation on the subject on three evenings between Mr. Smith, a practical business man and careful student of finance; Mr. Jones, an intelligent farmer; Mr. Vance, formerly a Greenbacker, now a Populist and silverman; and Mr. Burns, a common-sense laborer." When this issue of the Record reached Congressman Cannon at his home in Illinois, he read "Three Evenings with Silver." The next day, to quote his picturesque language, he threw himself on the train and went to Washington for more copies. The national committee had not yet organized nor sent out copies of any documents. Indeed, they did not organize for more than a month afterwards, and the silver propaganda was having its own way throughout the country. Mr. Cannon said: "I want something for my folks to chew on. This is just the thing for them. If I can get three thousand copies of this article, I will have every fellow on the street corner, in the stores and on the trains loaded up with something to answer all these silver fellows."

As the reprint which had been ordered would not be ready for some days Mr. Cannon proceeded to the capitol and ordered three thousand copies of the whole edition of the Record of that date and

took them back with him to Illinois. General Henderson had his fifty thousand copies promptly and this number was greatly increased to him afterwards. The demand all over the country for this document was immediate and sustained throughout the whole campaign. Over three million four hundred thousand copies of this document were distributed out of twenty-one million, the total sent out by the committee.

In the busy time incident to the formation of the committee, preparation of documents, and building up the force of employees, there was little time to think as to the authorship of this document. Mr. Babcock did not know; General Henderson was away, and the only clue the committee had was the "Journal" imprint; but they knew Mr. Dingley's style of argumentative discourse, and formed their own conclusions. Consequently after the first edition of one hundred thousand copies had been received from the printer and new editions were to be ordered, the committee sent several copies to Mr. Dingley with an intimation that they thought him either the author of, or as having inspired the writing of this pamphlet, and suggested that he go over the copy and make any changes or corrections which he desired. To this letter was received a reply from Squirrel Island, Maine, making a few changes and asking how the committee came to suspect him to be the author. Several letters passed on this subject, in the course of which Mr. Dingley acknowledged the authorship and expressed his pleasure at its universal acceptance as a most popular and timely document. It is very hard to estimate the number of votes changed by any document or its exact effect in a campaign. But this one was early in the field. The committee began sending out early in July and the demand for it continued up to the middle of October. It is the judgment of the national committee that it brought over to the Republican party more votes from those who had been carried away by the specious arguments in favor of free silver, than any other document published by either the congressional or the national committee in 1896.¹

The month of June brought quiet and rest to Mr. Dingley, save what little time he devoted to editorial work, which was really a

1—Washington, D. C., Dec. 5, 1896.—Hon Nelson Dingley Jr., Washington, D. C., My dear Mr. Dingley:—I desire to express to you not only for myself but on behalf of the Republican congressional committee, the great obligation we feel for the document furnished us by you called "Three Evenings with Silver and Money." It proved to be of the greatest service in the campaign and taxed our capacity to supply the demand for it. In fact we are unable to do so. No other document that was published or handled by this committee did such effective work. It was clear, concise and conveyed all the points at issue. With the wish

recreation for him. June 24 he left Lewiston for Concord, New Hampshire, where on the following day he attended the reunion of his class (1855) in Dartmouth college. There were nine members and Mr. Dingley presided. The following day he spoke briefly at the commencement dinner, returning to Boston June 27, where, in the evening he spoke at the Good Templars' banquet in Copley hall. July 1st, he spoke at Poland Springs, at the dedication of the Maine state building which had been moved from the World's Fair grounds in Chicago to Poland Springs. July 2 he visited Waterville college where he was a student from 1851 to 1853. In the evening he spoke at a Zeta Psi banquet. What sweet memories must have flooded his mind on this occasion!

July 4, 1895, was a memorable day for Lewiston. It was the 100th anniversary of the celebration of Independence day. The literary exercises took place in the park. Here Mr. Dingley "played the role of prophet." He predicted the growth of Lewiston and of Maine, and added: "I believe also that the future of this great Republic is to be grander than the past—grand as that has been. What duties and responsibilities rest on such a nation! Do you realize them? Truly, such a government of the people, by the people and for the people set by God's providence as the defender and protector of human rights, is not to perish from the earth, but is to go on from decade to decade increasing in population, in intelligence, in wealth, in prosperity, and in its beneficent influence on humanity."

July 5th in company with his wife and daughter he went to Squirrel Island, and there again drank in the health and strength which such a place can afford. Here with his grandchildren, he found that comfort and rest which fortified him for the arduous duties of public life.

This beautiful summer vacation will never be forgotten by those who enjoyed it at this island home. The sun seemed brighter, the air purer, life sweeter than in any other place on earth. It was one of the few summers when public business permitted Mr. Dingley's continued presence at this spot so dear to him. Fete day, established the year before, occurred August 10, and Mr. Dingley entered into the spirit of the occasion with unusual zest. At the lit-

and the belief that the Republican party will not disappoint those who have placed it in power, I am,

Very truly yours,

J. W. Babcock, Chairman.

The documents "Three Evenings with Silver" were printed in Philadelphia and the first shipment to Washington—over 248,000 copies—filled a car.

erary exercises in the Casino, Mr. Dingley gave an address ¹ of an historical character, interesting to all who ever visited Squirrel Island, and to all who see in it the social and wholesome side of Mr. Dingley's life. As one of the founders of this little summer colony, he conferred a boon upon thousands.

August 11 following Fete day was Sunday; and on the afternoon of that beautiful day a sunset praise service was held on the rugged rocks of south shore. The entire population of the island gathered on the rocks. An organ was placed in a suitable position, and a chorus that rendered impressive singing, stirred the souls of the audience. The day was perfect. The rays of the setting sun cast a heavenly glow over the assembled worshippers. The sea was calm and almost motionless. The mighty power of the waves was at rest. A peace that "passeth all understanding" possessed all nature and the souls of the humble worshippers. It was a scene never to be forgotten. A benediction seemed to hover over all. Never did the Creator seem so near. The speakers on this memorable occasion were, Mr. Dingley, Mr. Frye and Dr. Hiscox. Mr. Dingley's topic was: "The Love of God in Man." Never did he speak with such fervor and such earnestness. He seemed to be inspired, and his audience listened spell-bound. The beautiful words he uttered seemed to come straight from heaven. No disciple of Christ; no apostle of the Son of God could have spoken with greater tenderness or more devotion. The memory of that day and of Mr. Dingley's address, was ever an inspiration to all who were present.

The only important public event in which he participated this fall, was the ninth triennial national council of Congregational churches of the United States, October 9 to 14, at Syracuse, New York. Mr. Dingley was made moderator. About four hundred delegates were in attendance from every northern and several southern states, including an unusual number of the ablest members of the Congregational denomination, such as Reverend Doctors Gordon, Boynton, Clark, Baker, Cobb, and Quint of Massachusetts; Lawson, Northrup, and Twitchell of Connecticut; Meredith, Ward, Packard, Virgin and Choate of New York; Gunsaulus, Sturtevant and Noble of Illinois; Gladden of Ohio; Hallock, Williams and Brown of the Pacific coast and many others, together with D. L. Moody of Chicago, S. B. Capen of Boston and many other laymen. It was a large and brilliant assembly. Mr. Dingley

1—See Appendix.

received unusual social attention while in Syracuse. Friday evening, Former Senator Hiscock gave a dinner in his honor. Saturday evening the Zeta Psi fraternity of the university gave him a dinner. At the close of this busy and notable council, Mr. Dingley was given a vote of thanks for his splendid services as moderator.

The succeeding five weeks were filled with the usual duties of a busy journalist and public man. On the 5th of November elections took place in 12 states. The result indicated very clearly that the causes which operated the year previous to give such phenomenal Republican majorities, still continued to affect public opinion. These elections made it reasonably sure that the Republicans would win in the presidential contest of 1896.

November 25th Mr. Dingley spoke at a banquet given by the Portland club. Thanksgiving day this year did not bring the usual joys derived at a family reunion. Mr. Dingley's family was scattered; but fourteen, including his honored father and his brother and family, sat about the bountiful table. November 29 he left for Washington alone, and took up his abode in the familiar rooms at the Hamilton house.

CHAPTER XX.

1895-1896.

The fifty-fourth congress assembled in December, 1895, on the eve of a most important national convention. The business of the country was in a deplorable condition. The second administration of President Cleveland had proved a failure as far as the federal finances were concerned. Government bonds had been issued in a time of peace, partly to make up the deficit in the national treasury, and partly to replenish the gold reserve assailed because of a widespread lack of confidence. The new congress was powerless to take any positive action to relieve the country, because the senate was not in political accord with the house. The country was obliged to wait for another election, and a Republican government in all three branches.

In this congress were many of the old leaders—Wheeler of Alabama; Russell of Connecticut; Crisp and Turner of Georgia; Hopkins, Hitt and Cannon of Illinois; Steele of Indiana; Henderson, Lacey, Hull, Hepburn and Dolliver of Iowa; Evans and McCreary of Kentucky; Reed, Dingley, Milliken and Boutelle of Maine; Walker, McCall and Morse of Massachusetts; Tawney, McCleary and Towne of Minnesota; Catchings and Money of Mississippi; DeArmond and Dockery of Missouri; Meiklejohn of Nebraska; Payne, Sulzer and Sherman of New York; Grosvenor of Ohio; Grow and Dalzell of Pennsylvania; McMillin and Richardson of Tennessee; Bailey and Sayers of Texas; Swanson of Virginia; Babcock of Wisconsin.

Thomas B. Reed was the unanimous choice of the Republicans for speaker and was re-elected to that honorable position wherein only a short time before he was denounced as a "czar" and a "usurper."

President Cleveland's message to congress contained no surprises. It attempted to explain the hard times and depression on the theory that the protective tariff of 1890 had checked our exports and our foreign trade and on the theory that the presence of the greenbacks was a constant menace to the credit and confidence of the country. The redeeming feature of the message was the denunciation of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at 16 to 1. It was this declaration that completed the absolute divorce of Mr. Cleveland from the new Democratic party that was rapidly reaching the ascendancy.

In the drawing of seats Mr. Dingley was particularly unfortunate, his name being called among the very last. Mr. Chas. Curtis of Kansas very generously came forward and offered Mr. Dingley his seat in the second row—a commanding position.

On the eighth of November, 1895, Hon. Thomas F. Bayard, United States ambassador at the court of Great Britain made an address at the Edinburg Philosophic institution on "Individual Freedom the Germ of National Progress and Permanence." In the course of this address Mr. Bayard declared that the policy of protection "had done more to foster class legislation and create inequality of fortune, to corrupt public life, to banish men of independent mind and character from the public councils, to lower the tone of national representation, blunt public conscience, create false standards in the popular mind, to familiarize it with reliance upon state aid and guardianship in private affairs, divorce ethics from politics, and place politics upon the low level of a mercenary scramble, than any other single cause."

The indignation which swept over the country at the undiplomatic language of the ambassador, culminated in the house December 10, when Mr. McCall and Mr. Barrett of Massachusetts, each introduced resolutions on the matter—the first simply asking the president to inform the house "what steps if any he has taken to recall or to censure said Bayard;" the second boldly impeaching the ambassador and asking the committee on foreign relations "to report to the house such action by impeachment or otherwise as shall be proper in the premises." The second resolution secured consideration as a question of privilege, and a sharp partisan debate fol-

lowed. The Republican leaders, including Mr. Dingley and Mr. Hitt (the latter chairman of the committee on foreign affairs) were taken completely by surprise and sought to avert the scene which had been suddenly and unwisely precipitated. Mr. Dingley was quickly put forward to get the house out of its difficulty; and when he had once obtained the floor the excitement ceased. In a calm and dispassionate manner he discussed the resolution. Turning to Mr. Crisp of Georgia he said: "Does the gentleman from Georgia believe that an ambassador of all the people of the United States has a right to go upon a foreign platform and thus denounce one half or more of the people of this country?" Mr. Crisp sought to have Mr. Dingley admit that the language used by Mr. Bayard was not good ground for impeachment. Mr. Dingley replied: "In my judgment this is a case in which perhaps impeachment may not be the most expedient remedy. But that this house, representing the American people, should condemn such action on the part of their ambassador abroad, I have no doubt. My judgment is that such language, denouncing the people of this country, uttered in a foreign country by an ambassador of the United States, is an impeachable offense if the house desires to thus proceed. Whether it is wise to do so is another question." Finally the house, following the suggestion made by Mr. Dingley, struck out the words "by impeachment or otherwise" and the resolution thus amended was adopted and referred to the committee on foreign relations. Thus ended the Bayard impeachment episode.

Speaker Reed's selection of Mr. Dingley as chairman of the ways and means committee of this congress, was a glowing tribute to the latter's eminent fitness and rare qualifications for this important position. The speaker was impressed with the fact that this was the fitting thing to do, and that the appointment would meet with almost universal approval. Mr. Burrows and Mr. McKenna who served with Mr. Dingley and were his seniors on the committee of ways and means in the fifty-first congress, had been promoted to higher positions of trust. Mr. Dingley was not a member of this committee in the fifty-second or fifty-third congresses (having voluntarily stepped aside in December, 1891, to permit Mr. Reed to resume his old place on the committee on ways and means) and therefore was not entitled to the chairmanship by reason of seniority and promotion. Both Mr. Payne of New York and Mr. Dalzell of Pennsylvania were deserving of consideration on the score of seniority, and both were eminently qualified for the posi-

tion. But Speaker Reed did not lose sight of the fact that had Mr. Dingley remained on this committee he would have been the ranking member; and the unselfishness displayed by Mr. Dingley to Mr. Reed was not forgotten by the latter. Gratitude, justice, fitness and public sentiment all pointed to Mr. Dingley's selection.

Congress met December 2 and Mr. Reed sent for Mr. Dingley December 11 to assist in making up the house committees. Even at this late day the speaker simply intimated to Mr. Dingley what he intended to do, for the latter recorded in his diary on that date: "I am probably to be chairman of the ways and means committee." Speaker Reed knew that Mr. Dingley was the best equipped man in the house for this important position;¹ but feared that the many prominent places which Maine already held in the house might prevent him from appointing his good friend and wise adviser. But there developed a general desire among Republican members, including the members from New York, that Mr. Dingley should be assigned to this place; and speedily it became possible for Mr. Reed to carry out his wishes with substantially the unanimous approval of all members of the house, Republicans and Democrats alike. Seldom has a chairman of this important committee and a floor leader been chosen under such flattering circumstances. The committee was announced by the speaker as follows: Dingley, Maine, chairman; Payne, New York; Dalzell, Pennsylvania; Hopkins, Illinois; Grosvenor, Ohio; Russell, Connecticut; Dolliver, Iowa; Steele, Indiana; Johnson, North Dakota; Evans, Kentucky; Tawney, Minnesota; Crisp, Georgia; McMillin, Tennessee; Turner, Georgia; Tarsney, Missouri; Wheeler, Alabama; McLaurin, South Carolina. Mr. Dingley was heartily congratulated both personally and by letter.

In his message to congress, President Cleveland maintained that the financial ills of the government, necessitating the issue of bonds, was not due to the insufficient revenue under the tariff laws of 1894, but to the presence of greenbacks in the financial system. He said: "It is possible that the suggestion of increased revenue

1—F. L. Dingley in the Lewiston Journal wrote as follows: "While few men ever differed more widely in their temperament and intellect than Speaker Reed and Congressman Dingley, few men in congress were more closer and more trusted friends. The speaker's epigrams the chairman of the ways and means committee never failed to enjoy, even when fired at himself. You could not wound the chairman by any weapons which the kindly fun of the speaker handled. Mr. Reed had faith in Mr. Dingley's political judgment and warmly regarded his exact political information while Mr. Dingley had equal respect for the greatness of mind, sincerity of purpose and philosophic culture and poise of the speaker. Between these men there was never any collision of ambition or of temperament. It is true they did not uniformly agree, but if they did not agree they agreed that it was wholesome for each and no offense to either."

as a remedy for the difficulties we are considering may have originated in an intimation or distinct allegation that the bonds which have been issued ostensibly to replenish our gold reserve were really issued to supply insufficient revenue. Nothing can be farther from the truth. Bonds were issued to obtain gold for the maintenance of our national credit." On the 20th of December the president, alarmed over the financial condition of the country, sent another message to congress, in which he expressed the earnest hope that congress would not take a recess without doing something to satisfy the people that the government intended to meet every obligation it incurred. Mr. Dingley said: "The president having set the grass on fire and the blaze having got good headway, he now turns to congress and says: 'The grass is afire, gentlemen, I leave it for you to put out.'"

On the 21st of December at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, within two hours after he was appointed chairman, Mr. Dingley called a meeting of the ways and means committee for organization. That evening the Republican members conferred and agreed to report to the house immediately a tariff and bond bill, which the chairman was authorized to draw up. The critical condition of the federal treasury demanded prompt action, and it was decided not to adjourn the house for the usual holiday recess until the tariff and bond bills were passed.

Secretary Carlisle shared in the general alarm over the financial condition of the public treasury. He addressed a note to Chairman Dingley saying frankly that the treasury was in need and that he would be glad to furnish the committee on ways and means with any information in his possession relative to measures of relief. Mr. Dingley immediately went to the secretary and submitted to him a copy of the proposed bill authorizing an issue of three per cent coin bonds for the redemption of legal tender notes and its provision authorizing an issue of fifty million dollars of certificates of indebtedness bearing three per cent interest and redeemable in three years, to be used to supply deficits in the current expenses of the government. Mr. Dingley said frankly that it was useless for the government to pretend that there was no deficit in its accounts, and that if the revenue bill were passed it would enable the administration to pay its debts without touching the reserve fund. Mr. Carlisle insisted that there was no deficit; on the contrary there was a large sum of money in the treasury. Mr. Dingley pointed out that the money to which the secretary referred consisted of redeemed

legal tender notes and if the government paid them for its current expenses they would turn up immediately at the sub-treasury and the government's stock of gold would be cut down. To pay out greenbacks in this manner simply meant that the government was furnishing ammunition for fresh raids on the treasury. The only thing to do was to accept the bill as a relief law offered in good faith and not as a partisan enterprise. Mr. Dingley urged the secretary to consent to separating the banking business of the government from its ordinary business. He argued that if the government was able to meet its expenses out of a fund specially provided for that purpose by congress there would be no necessity of using greenbacks, and they would lie in the treasury accumulating from week to week, so long as the raid continued on the treasury. It was true that the law of 1878 required the secretary to re-issue greenbacks as soon as they were redeemed, but this law would be complied with by simply depositing the greenbacks in the cash account of the treasury. The government was not obliged to pay out legal tenders unless there was something to pay them out for. Therefore, the government could protect itself from raids by temporarily retaining its growing stock of legal tenders. Presently there would be a scarcity of greenbacks, and the hoarders of gold would be glad to exchange their coin for paper money. Mr. Dingley begged the secretary to give his assent to this scheme as the only practicable measure that would meet the situation. Mr. Carlisle assented to the idea that the temporary retention of greenbacks would greatly aid the government in maintaining the gold reserve, but he strenuously denied that the administration was in need of any revenue bill.

During this long and grave conversation Mr. Dingley and the secretary went over the bond bill to replenish the gold reserve, in much detail. Mr. Carlisle wanted the word "gold" substituted for the word "coin." The chairman replied that to make such a change would be sure to insure the defeat of the proposition by a three quarters majority in the senate, and such a sweeping defeat would create a bad impression all over the country and abroad, and would be calculated to seriously damage the credit of the government in any attempt to affect a loan on favorable terms. Mr. Carlisle appeared to assent to this argument. Then Mr. Dingley said he was firmly convinced that the bonds ought to be first offered by the government to the people of the United States. The people had plenty of gold and would readily respond to the appeal of the government. But ordinary men who were ignorant of the niceties of

finance could not bring themselves to the point of paying a premium for the bonds. Only bankers and banking syndicates understood how to calculate premiums. The common people would buy the bonds "flat"—at their face value. For that reason a three per cent bond had been acted upon. The committee of ways and means had determined upon a popular loan. At Mr. Carlisle's suggestion change after change was made in the language of the bill. Mr. Dingley complained that the administration's great mistake was in waiting too long before issuing bonds, and that the president took too much pains to alarm the public about the credit of the government in advance of its calls for loans. Had there been an issue of fifty million dollars of bonds in April, 1893, the treasury department would probably have stopped the raids permanently by having a reserve of \$150,000,000, if revenue had been larger than expenditures.

Mr. Carlisle returned to his objections to the word "coin," but was met by the statement that all the administration had to do was to stop its alarmist utterances and make executive declaration that the bonds would be redeemed in gold. That would accomplish the purpose quite as well. The chairman said that he was willing to allow the free silver men to offer an amendment and then, with the help of the administration, vote it down by a huge majority. That in itself would greatly strengthen the government's credit.

Mr. Carlisle seemed pleased and answered that he would be glad to see it done. As for the popular loan idea the secretary did not offer any very serious objection, merely saying that it would tend to delay matters too long.

When Mr. Dingley left the treasury department he was under the impression that the secretary had assented in a general way to the whole measure with the exception of the word "coin." Every other change suggested by him had been made. But on December 26 Mr. Dingley received a letter from Mr. Carlisle calling his attention to the fact that an impression had been created in some quarters that the committee's bill had received his approval. That letter was as follows:

Washington, D. C., Dec. 26, 1895.

Hon. Nelson Dingley Jr.,

Chairman Ways and Means Committee.

Dear Sir:—

I understand that the impression has been created in some quarters that the bill reported, or to be reported by the committee on

ways and means, so amending the act of January 14, 1875, as to authorize the issue of a three per cent coin bond, had been submitted to me and had received my approval. This impression has probably resulted from the fact that you presented the proposed bill to me and had an interview with me upon the subject before the measure was finally disposed of in the committee. In order to prevent any misapprehension upon the subject, I desire to say that the views expressed by me at the interview mentioned have not been changed in the least, and that, in my opinion, a mere extension of the authority to issue a coin bond will not afford the relief which the existing emergency demands. In that interview I expressed the opinion that the only permanent remedy for our financial difficulties was the retirement and cancellation of the legal tender notes, but that, inasmuch as it was evident that such a measure could not be adopted in time to extricate the treasury from its present embarrassments, the only effective steps that could now be taken were first, a declaration by congress in the form of a joint resolution or otherwise that all bonds and notes heretofore issued by the United States except such subsidy bonds as are by their expressed terms payable otherwise, shall be paid in United States gold of the present standard weight and fineness, or in standard silver dollars, at the option of the holders of said bonds or notes; and second, that any bonds hereafter issued under the laws now in force may, at the discretion of the secretary of the treasury, be made payable by their terms in gold coin, but that no bond payable by its terms in gold coin should bear a rate of interest exceeding three per centum per annum, payable quarterly. As to the second section of your bill, I expressed the opinion, which I have always entertained, that the secretary of the treasury should have permanent authority to issue short time bonds, or certificates, to supply casual deficiencies in the revenue, and the only objection I made to that section was that the authority was limited to an issue of fifty million dollars in the aggregate.

Very truly yours,

J. G. Carlisle. ¹

The chairman of the ways and means committee became immediately aware of the fact that the administration was throwing its whole weight and influence against the relief bill, apparently because of the provision for a popular bond issue. That idea seemed

¹—The main facts in this story of the conference between Secretary Carlisle and Mr. Dingley were originally published in the *New York World*. Mr. Dingley subsequently corrected the story.

to displease somebody in the administration. It was Mr. Dingley's intention, and he had already expressed it to several of his colleagues, to provide in the rule for allowing a vote on the amendment, but the strength of the administration's opposition was such that he feared a combination of Democrats and free silver men, and at once decided to protect his bill by shutting off all amendments.

The critical condition of the country demanded prompt action, and it was decided not to adjourn the house for the usual holiday recess, until the tariff and bond bills were passed.

Christmas day was no holiday for the committee on ways and means. Mr. Dingley called the members together; and after a sharp contest in which the Democrats opposed the measures, it was agreed to report the chairman's tariff and bond bills. In the afternoon the chairman prepared the reports. The tariff bill, increasing the import duties on wool, woolen goods, lumber, live stock, cereal, dairy and other products, (an estimated increase of forty million dollars annually in the public revenue) was considered in the house December 26. Mr. Dingley opened the debate.¹ He pointed out the necessity for the immediate relief of the treasury and said that "the first duty is to provide sufficient revenue to meet the expenditures." He urged prompt action to restore the credit of the nation, leaving for a later time a complete revision of the tariff along protective lines. The bill was passed before the house adjourned that afternoon, and the result greeted with loud applause on the Republican side.

On the following day, the bond bill, authorizing the secretary of the treasury to issue three per cent bonds for the redemption of United States legal tender notes, and to issue certificates of indebtedness to an amount not exceeding fifty million dollars to provide for any temporary deficiency, was reported to the house. Mr. Dingley opened the debate.¹ He explained that the real object of the bond bill was to enable the secretary of the treasury to borrow money if need be at three per cent. In discussing the gold reserve and its depletion, Mr. Dingley said: "From 1879 to 1893 there was no run on the treasury gold. We had one hundred million dollars of gold in the redemption fund all the time, and we maintained this fund all the time at that figure, the revenue being more than the expenditures, the country in a prosperous condition through the economic policy then prevailing; and when the industries of the country were prosperous nobody wanted gold. We can return to the same condition only by a return to the same economic sys-

1—See Appendix.

tem which then prevailed." On the following day the bill was passed amid loud applause on the Republican side. The vote was 171 to 136. "A great week's work," Mr. Dingley recorded in his diary. The whole country commended the prompt work of the house.

For some time previous to the assembling of this congress, there had been a dispute as to the boundary between Venezuela and British Guiana. This government addressed a note to the British government expressing the hope that Great Britain would unite with Venezuela in submitting the dispute to arbitration. The Monroe doctrine was appealed to in justification of the action of this government. On the 21st of December President Cleveland sent a message to congress, reaffirming his former position and informing congress that Lord Salisbury refused to arbitrate the boundary question. The president asked for an appropriation and authority to appoint a commission to inquire into and report the actual state of facts, adding that "it will be the duty of the United States to resist, by every means in its power, as a wilful aggression upon its rights and interests, the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands, etc., which after investigation we have determined of right belongs to Venezuela."

This message naturally alarmed the country, and increased the distrust arising from the critical financial condition of the country. Conservative men, including Mr. Dingley, condemned what they called the "snapper" or last paragraph of the message. Mr. Dingley said: "This declaration was uncalled for. The snapper has made co-operation almost impossible and alarmed both countries."

But congress gave the president the authority he asked for; and early in January the commission was appointed, consisting of Justice Brewer, Judge Alvey, President White of Cornell university, Attorney Coudert, and President Gilman of Johns Hopkins university. The controversy was finally settled by arbitration, Great Britain yielding.

January 16 and 17 Mr. Dingley presided over the committee of the whole in the house, while the pension appropriation bill was under consideration. Mr. Mahon of Pennsylvania proposed an amendment, whereupon Mr. Bartlett of New York raised the point of order that it violated the rule against "any provision on any general appropriation bill changing existing law." In an elaborate ruling, Mr. Dingley sustained the point of order. Mr. Mahon said: "I listened very attentively to the ruling of the distinguished occupant of the chair. I agree that it is correct in every particular.

I recognize that it would be useless to press any amendment before the present occupant of the chair. I will present the amendment again when the chair is occupied by some other gentleman. I will try it on him." This remark was greeted with loud laughter.

The senate debated the Dingley bond bill for six weeks, and on the first of February passed it by a vote of 42 to 35, with a free silver coinage amendment. The free coinage senators formed an alliance with the free coinage representatives, and not only agreed to prevent the passage of a bond bill without a free silver coinage attachment, but also laid the foundation of the free silver party and started the free silver campaign of 1896.

February 4, the committee on ways and means by a strict party vote, ordered a non-concurrence in the senate amendments. The following day Mr. Dingley opened the debate in the house, on the free silver coinage and greenback redemption amendment of the senate.¹ For two hours he held the close attention of both sides of the house, unfolding in a logical and masterful manner, the proposition presented by the senate amendments. He pointed out the danger of redeeming the treasury notes in silver if gold was demanded; the inevitable destruction of the nation's credit; and the folly of the proposition to coin silver on private account to an unlimited extent at the ratio of 16 to 1. He closed with an eloquent appeal to take up the question as a practical and scientific one. "I know of no question," he said, "that is more dangerous to commit to the stormy and changing sea of politics than the question of money; and I deplore beyond expression that such a question as this should have been dragged into ward caucuses and conventions and treated on a purely partisan and political basis. Mr. Chairman, while the people of this country generally desire to secure a restoration of full bimetallism whenever it can be accomplished and maintain the parity of the two kinds of money, yet I believe that our people never will consent to any policy which it is believed will cause the two metals to separate; will drive out gold and make us a silver monometallic country." Mr. Dingley closed amid long and loud applause. This speech was the keynote of the approaching Republican campaign against the proposed new Democracy founded on the "paramount issue" of free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. It was pronounced the ablest presentation of the case that had thus far been made; and was used as a campaign document in the presidential contest the following summer and fall. The free coinage advocates in the

1—See Appendix.

house attempted the next day without avail, to break down Mr. Dingley's argument. It was, however, unanswerable.

An incident occurred in the house February 7, which demonstrated Mr. Dingley's quiet influence in and control over the house. An exciting debate occurred over a remark of Mr. Talbert of South Carolina, who declared that "secession is right and under the same circumstances he would fight the old flag again." The house had worked itself into a feverish condition and trouble was brewing when Mr. Dingley quietly suggested that the whole matter be referred to the judiciary committee. He declared that bitter partisan debates over the "bloody shirt" had no place in the deliberations of the house.¹

February 13 and 14 the bond bill was taken up in the house; and under the astute leadership of Mr. Dingley the Republicans defeated every mischievous amendment offered and on the second day voted (90 to 215) to non-concur in the senate free coinage amendment. The result was greeted with applause. Mr. Dingley's rare qualities of leadership appeared to splendid advantage on this memorable occasion, while the house and the whole country watched with great anxiety the shrewd and successful movements of this new parliamentary leader. The house was so indignant that the senate should substitute for the house bill a free coinage measure having no connection with the measure in hand, that it refused to ask the senate for a conference. The popular loan bill was dead; and the senate refused to pass the other bill of Mr. Dingley's raising the revenue of the country. The indications were that congress would adjourn without giving the public treasury any relief; and the rumor was circulated that President Cleveland would call an extra session of congress. Mr. Dingley said: "If the president wants more revenue to put an end to the deficiencies and obviate the necessity of paying out redeemed greenbacks to meet current expenditures, he has only to ask his Democratic friends in the senate to support the revenue bill which has passed the house, instead of solidly voting with the Populists against it." The bond bill had already been killed by the free silver coinage rider; and on the 25th of February, the senate by a vote of 22 to 33

1—An amusing incident said to have happened during this debate was current at this time. Mr. Dingley thought that time was being wasted, and that the house ought to adjourn. He made his motion just as some facetious member propounded the old question: "What did the gentleman from North Carolina say to the gentleman from South Carolina?" In chorus from a number of members came, "It's a long time between drinks." Not realizing the application, Mr. Dingley jumped to his feet and said: "Mr. Speaker, then I move that the house do now adjourn." Mr. Reed was convulsed with laughter in which most of the members joined as the gavel fell.

refused to consider the emergency revenue bill. A combination of Populists and Democrats accomplished this result. Thus the senate refused to aid the national treasury at this critical period.

February 25 the Alaska seal fisheries again came to the front in the house. Mr. Dingley secured the passage of a bill providing for the co-operation of the United States with Great Britain, Russia and Japan in the appointment of a commission "to investigate the present condition, habits and feeding grounds of the fur-seal herd;" authorizing the president to conclude a *modus vivendi* to terminate January 1, 1898; and further authorizing the secretary of the treasury (if Great Britain declines to co-operate) to take and sell the skins of the seals and cover the proceeds into the treasury. The necessity for such a course arose from the fact that Canadian pelagic sealers were rapidly exterminating the seals, and sending the skins to England, while the United States was ineffectually attempting to carry out the regulations of the Paris tribunal.

During the month of March Mr. Dingley suffered considerably from an attack of influenza or "grip," and was unable to attend the sessions of the house regularly. His nervous system suffered from a catarrhal difficulty, and he was far from well. On the 9th of April, however, he spoke briefly in favor of a bill to abolish compulsory pilotage. It was the same bill in which he was interested in previous congresses—a bill relieving vessels adequately piloted by a United States pilot from paying another fee to a state pilot. The bill was defeated.

Congress became very much excited about this time over the struggles of the Cubans against the misrule of Spain and resolutions were introduced in both house and senate of a more or less belligerent character. After weeks of fiery debate, the framing of a proper resolution was referred to a conference committee; and on the sixth of April by a vote of 247 to 27 (80 not voting) the resolution reported by the conference committee was adopted by the house. It declared that "in the opinion of congress, a condition of public war exists between the government of Spain and the government proclaimed and for some time maintained by force of arms by the people of Cuba; and that the United States of America should maintain a strict neutrality between the contending powers, according to each all the rights of belligerents in the ports and territory of the United States," and that "the friendly offices of the United States should be offered by the president to the Spanish government for the recognition of the independence of Cuba."

This conservative and harmless language was finally forced into the resolution by the wiser members of congress; nevertheless nobody at that time dreamed of the near approach of the war arising from this same subject.

April 11 Mr. Dingley addressed the house on the bill to impose a tax on the manufacture of filled or imitation cheese. In this address ¹ he discussed the power of the government to use its taxing power as a police regulation.

April 15 Mr. Dingley was unanimously renominated for representative in congress by the Republicans of the second Maine district. It was another tribute to his character and ability.

Mr. Dingley was not as a rule fond of dinner parties or festivities of any kind. He much preferred the quiet atmosphere of his study and the society of his family. He was often joked by his more jovial and convivial associates in the house, who were very fond of their floor leader, and yet marveled at his serious and sober life. Mr. Dingley broke the apparent monotony of official life and labors, by attending a dinner given by Representative Newlands in the grove at Chevy Chase, a beautiful spot a few miles from Washington. Quite a party of members of the house were present among them Speaker Reed. Mr. Reed was very fond of cracking some joke at the expense of Mr. Dingley and Mr. Dingley invariably took it kindly and usually smiled. Mr. Dingley's glasses were all turned bottom up, and he listened to the stories with apparent stoicism. Finally Mr. Reed glanced at his colleague and drawled: "Governor, you don't seem to enjoy these jokes. What's the matter?" "O, I laughed at them twenty years ago," replied Mr. Dingley quietly. The whole party was convulsed at this the best joke of the evening.

The hour growing late, Mr. Dingley quietly slipped out of the room unobserved bidding adieu to the host. In a few moments Mr. Reed noticed Mr. Dingley's absence, and pulling up the table cloth he peeped under the table. "Mr. Speaker, what are you doing?" inquired one of the guests. "Finding out what became of Dingley," replied Mr. Reed.

Mr. Dingley's brief comment in his diary on this notable dinner was that "he had a good time."

On the second of May he spoke briefly in the house on the bankruptcy bill. While the house was debating the deficiency appropriation bill, April 20, the leaders of the minority started a discussion on the question of responsibility for the deficit and the industrial conditions. Mr. Dockery of Missouri taunted the Repub

¹—See Appendix.

licans with having done nothing to cure the deficit. Mr. Dingley charged ¹ a large share of the decrease in the revenue to the change from specific to ad valorem duties, instituted by the Wilson bill of 1894. He defended the course of the majority in the house, which, he said, passed bills to increase revenue and reduce the rate of interest on bonds. Both these measures of relief were met by the solid opposition of the Democrats in the house and by a combination of Democrats and Populists in the senate. The debate brought out very clearly that not only was the Democratic administration responsible for deficiencies and the issue of bonds, but for refusing to enact the emergency revenue and bond bills which would have relieved the public treasury and saved the people millions of dollars.

On the fifth of May, the house had passed all the appropriation bills; and on the following day, Mr. Dingley reported from the committee on ways and means a concurrent resolution in the house, providing for the final adjournment of Congress May 18. The resolution was greeted with applause and agreed to at once. The record of this house in the prompt passage of appropriation bills was excelled by no previous house; and the credit was largely due to the industry of Mr. Dingley as floor leader and chairman of the ways and means committee.

The intense feeling against President Cleveland on the part of the members of congress who favored the free coinage of silver, and who opposed the issue of gold bonds, manifested itself in the house May 23, when Mr. Howard, a Populist member from Alabama, offered a bill of impeachment against President Cleveland for selling bonds without any authority of law; for misappropriating the proceeds of the bonds; for disregarding the law which makes United States notes redeemable in coin; and for several other alleged offenses. This attempt to impeach the president created a sensation; and Mr. Dingley by raising the question of consideration, caused the house to refuse to consider the matter.

The financial tendencies of a majority of the senate, and its opposition to President Cleveland, was again manifest when a bill was considered in the senate May 21, to prohibit the further issue of government bonds without the consent of congress. After a long and tedious debate, the bill was passed in the senate by a vote of 32 to 25. This bill came over to the house and was referred to the committee on ways and means. Mr. Dingley was the commanding spirit in the committee discussion of this bill; and on the fifth of

1—See Appendix.

June he reported the bill adversely to the house. The accompanying report¹ written by Mr. Dingley, was an able and comprehensive discussion of the question of interest-bearing bonds. In it he said that the attempt to deprive the secretary of the power to borrow for the purpose of maintaining the redemption fund, when there had been for three years a large deficiency of revenue, raised the query whether it is not the deliberate purpose of the promoters to plunge the government into repudiation and depreciated greenbacks. In view of the fact that so many members of the house were unwilling to go on record at this critical juncture as voting against this bill, it was deemed best to allow it to remain on the calendar. Mr. Dingley was personally opposed to such a course, but out of deference to many of his colleagues, yielded.

June 8, Mr. Dingley secured the passage through the house of a joint resolution authorizing a scientific investigation of the fur-seal fisheries, during the fiscal years of 1896 and 1897.

The closing hours of this session were full of excitement. Party lines were closely drawn, and party speeches made, for it was the eve of a great presidential election. The veto of the river and harbor bill by President Cleveland and its passage over his veto, had given the minority in the house a text on which to dwell with partisan bitterness. On the 10th of June Mr. Dockery of Missouri, one of the strongest of the minority in the house, assailed the Republican majority for its extravagance. "This congress," he said, "is the most recklessly improvident and riotously extravagant congress since the establishment of the government." He charged that the difficulty with the country was the inadequate revenue under the McKinley tariff, and the reckless extravagance of the present congress. He added: "I arraign the do-nothing policy of the Republican party announced by the distinguished speaker of the house and by his almost equally eminent colleague, Mr. Dingley."

Mr. Dingley replied to Mr. Dockery in a speech of great force and power.² He analyzed the financial condition of the country and made it clear where the responsibility rested. He reviewed the disasters following the tariff of 1894 and said that "we have had a kindergarten on a large scale. The tuition came high but no people ever learned so much in so short a time." He warned the minority that "in November next the people will complete the work which they set out to accomplish in 1894. Then we shall re-establish protection."³

1—See Appendix.

2—The Washington correspondent of the New York Tribune wrote: "It is seldom indeed that one can find in three pages or any number of pages of the

At 4 o'clock on the afternoon of June 11, the house with the usual confusion, adjourned without day. On the following day, Mr. Dingley with his faithful wife left Washington for his home in Maine, where he was warmly greeted and congratulated by a host of admiring friends.

As chairman of the committee on ways and means and as leader of the majority on the floor of the house, Mr. Dingley was a pronounced success. His industry and perseverance made him master of the details of the tariff and everything pertaining to the customs and revenue department of the government. His committee room was the headquarters of all who desired special information or assistance in the way of legislation. Always patient and courteous, he listened to the stories of all, encouraged some and advised others. He was known throughout the capitol as a walking encyclopedia of information, and none came to him in vain. As floor leader, he was all that Speaker Reed or his colleagues could desire. Filled with accurate information; always fair and just; he won the respect and admiration of all members regardless of party. The house learned to have complete confidence in him, and his word was to them law. An incident is often told of a member of this house who was exceedingly deaf. His admiration of Mr. Dingley amounted to almost worship. His deafness often prevented him hearing the questions as they were put by the chair. Invariably when such a predicament presented itself this afflicted member could be seen edging toward Mr. Dingley's seat. Then

congressional record so much truth, buttressed by facts that are indisputable, as may be found in today's issue of that publication under the caption, 'The changed conditions of the country, the cause and remedy.' This is the title of the speech that Chairman Dingley of the ways and means committee, delivered in the house of representatives Wednesday in reply to Mr. Dockery of Missouri. In the course of his career in congress Gov. Dingley has delivered many strong and forcible and persuasive speeches on economic subjects, which have gained for him an enviable reputation as a statesman, but never until last Wednesday was he able to marshal such an overwhelming and impregnable array of facts in support of the principles which he has always advocated since he first became a member of the house of representatives. The speech surprised everybody—even men who had known Mr. Dingley longest—and it surprised nobody more than the men who had believed that the chairman of the ways and means committee was destitute of the power of sarcasm or too gentle to use it if he did possess it. 'Who would have supposed that Mr. Dingley had ever heard of Josh Billings or read one of his sayings?' was the question his friends asked one another in amazement as he opened his speech with the remark that as he listened to Dockery he was reminded of the quaint saying of Josh Billings that 'It is better not to know so many things, than to know so many things that ain't so.' That criticism of the speech to the preparation of which the Missourian had devoted weeks, was as penetrating and merciless as it was unexpected, but it was fully justified by the statements with which Representative Dingley supported it."

This speech was widely circulated as a campaign document, the congressional committee distributing more than seven hundred thousand copies while many more thousands were ordered printed by various congressmen and distributed in their districts.

putting his left hand to his ear, he would say to the leader in a hoarse whisper: "Governor, how shall I vote?" And he voted just as he was told and always voted right.

Mr. Dingley guided the destinies of the majority by his kindness, fairness and respect for others. He was throughout this session, beloved by all his colleagues. Many of them told of their experiences with this modest, quiet leader—how they as new members went to him for advice, and how kindly they were always received. Whatever information this leader had acquired by hard work and close application he freely imparted to others. Spoken Reed's quick wit and active intellect was supplemented and guarded by Mr. Dingley's accurate information and unerring judgment.

The Republican national convention met at St. Louis June 16. It was destined to be one of the most memorable conventions in the history of the party. This gathering was to determine a second time the fixed policy of the Republican party on the money question. The greenback and fiat money craze had somewhat disturbed the equilibrium of political parties a quarter of a century previous; and the Republican party stood for sound money. So in this convention, the Republican party declined to be led astray by the "crime of 1873," "the gold bugs," "the free and unlimited coinage of silver at 16 to 1 without the consent of any other nation on earth." The national convention met at St. Louis, and, as Mr. Dingley predicted, stood squarely on the gold standard—on a sound money platform. Many Republicans were deceived by "16 to 1," but the correct course of the party in its national convention was as clear as noonday to those who were familiar with the financial history of the country and the financial record of the party. Mr. Dingley's firm and unyielding position on the money question, and his increasing hostility to the doctrine of "16 to 1" was a guide and inspiration to the leaders in that convention who framed the financial plank in the national platform.


As a warm personal friend and admirer of his colleague, Mr. Reed, he was friendly to Mr. Reed's presidential aspirations; but he fully realized that William McKinley, a western candidate, was backed by practically the solid west. It was evident to Mr. Dingley some time before the convention, that Mr. McKinley would be nominated; and he hastened to say to all inquiries that Mr. Reed, if he failed to secure the nomination, would not retire from public life for he was needed in congress. William McKinley was nominated for president on the 18th, and Garrett A. Hobart of New Jersey was nominated for vice president. A few days prior to the con-

vention the newspapers reported that Mr. Dingley's name was mentioned at St. Louis for the vice presidency. His laconic comment recorded in his diary was: "Probably nothing but a suggestion, as I have heard nothing of it before." He could not have been induced under any consideration to accept the nomination for vice president.

Of the nomination of Mr. McKinley Mr. Dingley said: "We, in Maine, hoped that our own Thomas B. Reed would be the nominee, and to that end labored until the votes of the delegates had been registered. We gracefully yield to the preferences of a majority of the representatives of the Republicans of the country, just as we know they would have gracefully yielded and joined us if the man from Maine had been the chosen one. But in accepting Mr. McKinley as our standard bearer, we have the satisfaction of knowing that he is a worthy nominee—able, experienced, wise and patriotic, and that in his hands the interests of the nation will be safe. While our candidate for president has failed in the nomination, yet Thomas B. Reed has conducted himself with such dignity, such manliness and such courtesy as to make him stronger than ever with the great body of the American people. Not a word has been uttered by him, or by Mr. McKinley, in the canvass just closed which reflects on either, or leaves them anything but the strong personal friends they have always been. Speaker Reed has done so great service to the American people that the American party will not willingly have him retire from the position in which he has served with such credit to himself and honor to the nation."


Concerning the secession from the Republican ranks of the twenty-two "free silver" delegates to the national convention, Mr. Dingley said: "I can understand the intensity of the desire of the silver mine owners to turn every fifty cents worth of their silver into dollars without paying for their manufacture; I can understand how the environment of Teller and his associates has influenced their judgment; but I cannot understand why anybody else should follow in support of a scheme whose end would be such unparalleled evil."

The Democratic national convention, held in Chicago in July, was one of the most remarkable political gatherings the country had ever seen. The Democrats were turned aside, and the advocates of 16 to 1 free silver swept the convention like a whirlwind and nominated William J. Bryan of Nebraska for president. Mr. Dingley said: "Such an unexpected nomination of a man whom probably not a dozen members of the convention would have re-



D. B. HENDERSON. S. E. PAYNE.
J. A. TAWNEY. J. P. DOLLIVER.

1



garded as suitable for such a position, affords another illustration, not only of the uncertainties of politics, but also of the volatile character of a large convention. It was emphatically a nomination born of an eloquent speech."

The nomination of Arthur Sewell of Bath, Maine, by this convention, on a 16 to 1 free silver platform, was a great surprise to Mr. Dingley and the people of Maine. "Evidently there is music ahead in the Democratic ranks of Maine," said Mr. Dingley.

Of the platform adopted by the Chicago convention Mr. Dingley said: "Taken as a whole it would be difficult to conceive of a program which, when fully carried out, would more completely destroy national and private credit, paralyze trade and industries, diminish wages and opportunities for labor, and turn back the tide of progress in this country. There can be no returning prosperity until this assault on order, law and a sound currency is repelled and disposed of."

The state campaign in Maine opened about the middle of August. It was important as indicating in some measure, the attitude of the Republican party on the doctrine of 16 to 1 free silver coinage, which was the corner stone of the Bryan Democracy. Maine had experienced the vicissitudes and the uncertainties of a greenback campaign; and the Republicans were somewhat prepared for this new financial fallacy which was sweeping over the country. No man in Maine was better equipped for the approaching discussion of financial principles than Mr. Dingley, and with voice and pen he sounded the keynote and fought the battles of national honor. His speeches and editorials were important factors in shaping and winning this state campaign. He made twenty speeches in his own district and illuminated the whole subject of finance, so that when the votes were counted Monday night, September 14, it was found that he had been re-elected by over 13,000 plurality, and the Republican state ticket by over 48,000 plurality. In commenting on the election Mr. Dingley said: "The rural parts of the state have shown as surprising gains as the cities and manufacturing towns. The farmers have been as solid in rejecting the free silver heresy as the manufacturers; and the workingman is as emphatic in that direction as the business man. All alike have declared that after a most careful discussion of the new issue the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 meant nothing but silver for our metallic money and a silver basis, and a depreciated dollar, and that these would prove a calamity for all. The people

of Maine declare for revenue sufficient to run the government, a return to the policy of the adjustment of duties so as to encourage our own industries and labor, and a stable currency of which every dollar shall be equal in value to gold."

During this important and critical state campaign Mr. Dingley secured some rest at his summer home. Here he wrote many of the editorials on financial questions which appeared in the *Lewiston Journal* and which were guides to all doubtful voters in the state. Nor was he ever too busy to listen to the childish stories of his grandchildren, or to play games with them. He even recorded in his diary the birthdays of his children and grandchildren, so firm was his grasp of details.

At the urgent request of the Republican national committee, Mr. Dingley, on the last day of September, started on a speaking tour in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Michigan. He was not physically able to undertake this task, and reluctantly yielded. He spoke twice in Ohio, four times in Indiana, four times in Illinois and three times in Michigan—in a majority of cases at great out of door mass meetings in rural sections of the states, and also in several large cities, including Cleveland and Chicago. The meeting in Chicago (October 10) was in a large tent with an audience estimated at twenty thousand people. He reached his home in Lewiston October 20, and told of his experiences. "I have never seen," he said, "a succession of so large political meetings in any campaign; and not even in war times have I witnessed greater enthusiasm. It was noticeable that there was a very large attendance of sound money Democrats at each meeting, scores of whom would take me by the hand after each meeting and say to me that they proposed this year to vote the Republican ticket. I found more or less free silver sentiment among Republican farmers, particularly those who were Greenbackers in 1877-8; but at every point I learned that these men were rapidly giving up the free silver theory and returning to the Republican fold. The conditions of all the states in which I spoke seemed to me to be strikingly similar to what I found in the Maine campaign—so similar that I believe they foreshadow a Republican triumph in the west far more decisive than is generally expected. I spent several hours with Major and Mrs. McKinley at Canton, Ohio, and lunched with them. I found Major McKinley in excellent health and spirits, notwithstanding he was constantly receiving delegations and making brief speeches; and entirely confident that he would be triumphantly elected."

Mr. Dingley was very much exhausted after this speaking tour, and aggravated a bronchial difficulty which never entirely left him, and which contributed to his final physical collapse.

The result of the presidential election in November justified Mr. Dingley's predictions. William McKinley was elected president. The country breathed freer. The business and industries of the land felt that a crushing burden had been removed. The dark clouds which had hung over the country for so many months showed a rift through which the golden sunlight streamed. The distrust which had so long paralyzed business and industries gave way to rising confidence. The greatest peril with which the country had been threatened since the close of the civil war had been overcome. Mr. Dingley sent a telegram of congratulations to Major McKinley.

He was confined to his house a large part of the time during the remaining weeks of November. His catarrh caused him no little annoyance, and it was a long time before the trouble yielded to treatment. On the 23rd of November he received a letter from President-elect McKinley, asking Mr. Dingley to visit him at Canton, Ohio, at his earliest convenience, before the assembling of congress. December 2nd he started for Canton, Ohio, reaching there the following day.¹

1—Walter Wellman, the well-known correspondent, wrote in November, 1896: "President-elect McKinley and Mr. Dingley served together on the ways and means committee when the famous McKinley law was framed. They know one another as one knows a member of his own family. Their friendship is close, strong and enduring. 'Governor McKinley will make one of the greatest presidents we have ever had in the White House,' said Mr. Dingley. 'He has grown remarkably ever since he left congress. He has had the wonderful incentive of fate—a fate that was drawing him nearer great responsibilities and honors. McKinley is a perfectly rounded man. His knowledge of things is equal to his knowledge of men. Some presidents know one and some the other. McKinley knows both. He has the most remarkable faculty to bring men together I have ever seen in public life and that is a great quality in a president. Major McKinley's temper is well nigh perfect. He has infinite patience and tact. I used to marvel at him when we were making the tariff law of 1890. There were annoyances then such as you could not dream. Men were stubborn and selfish and brutal beyond the imagination. I do not speak of the members of the committee, for in the committee we had no trouble, but of outsiders. McKinley's conduct toward them was patience itself. It was simply phenomenal. He is the same today. He is now at his best. He is in his very prime. He is equipped for the difficult task of the presidency as few men have been before him. He will make a success. He will be his own president. One thing I cannot understand, and that is why a man should be thought weak because he is sweet of manner and patient and considerate of others. To my mind these are marks of strength. In McKinley's case I know they are. I have studied him carefully and I can say that he will have peace if he can. He will preserve harmony by yielding in non-essentials, the little things which make for nothing of intrinsic value. But when it comes to principles, the great things to the end in view, he is a rock.'"

CHAPTER XXI.

1896-1897.

President McKinley's first administration really began immediately after the national election of November, 1896. The responsibilities placed upon him by the deliberate action of the people in that memorable contest, forced themselves at once upon the newly chosen executive. He summoned to his home the ablest and wisest men of his party for the purpose of settling upon a policy to be pursued, and selecting a cabinet to assist in promoting that policy.

In forming his ministry, the president-elect was not guided by geographical consideration. He looked for men who could aid him in making a successful and harmonious administration. It was the quality of the men that counted.

It had already been repeatedly intimated in the public press that the president would probably select Mr. Dingley as his secretary of the treasury, for, in the chairman of the ways and means committee the president saw the ideal officer who harmonized the relations between the cabinet and congress. He knew very well that there was no other man in the country so well prepared, by natural gifts and training, in the public service, for this arduous task.

Mr. Dingley's extreme modesty over the compliments that were showered upon him by the newspapers and public men, was characteristic. He said quietly to a friend: "Since my name has been so much mentioned in the newspapers as a possible member of Mr. McKinley's cabinet, a great many of both political parties have called upon me to extend their good wishes. I do not know anything at all about the cabinet place which they talk of, but I do know that I have been touched by these expressions of good will

from so many of my associates. They are worth more than forty public offices."

Before departing for President McKinley's home, Mr. Dingley conferred with many of his close political friends in his district, with his physician and with members of his family, as to the advisability of his accepting the position of secretary of the treasury, in case he should be asked to join President McKinley's official family. A majority, particularly the members of his family, advised against it, largely on account of his health. Folger and Manning and Windom had succumbed to the hard and exacting duties of the secretary of the treasury; and Mr. Dingley while doubtless able to perform the duties of the office with comparative ease, would have seriously impaired his health.

Mr. Dingley reached Canton, Ohio, on the morning of December 3. He was driven at once to Mr. McKinley's residence where he was warmly welcomed by the president-elect. At lunch President McKinley sat at the head of the table, Mrs. McKinley on his left and Mr. Dingley on his right. Senator Thurston of Nebraska, Senator Mason of Illinois, and a son of Mr. Dingley were also seated at the table. The conversation was naturally on political topics, and through it all, Mr. Dingley's accurate and marvelous memory of facts and figures manifested itself. After lunch, Mr. McKinley and Mr. Dingley retired to an upper room, where a long conference was held in private, about revenue and tariff matters. Mr. Dingley urged the president-elect to call an extra session of congress immediately after March 4th, in order to provide the public treasury with more revenue. "By that time," said Mr. Dingley, "a tariff bill will be ready."

Before the interview closed, the president-elect said: "Governor, I always said that if I were ever president, I would make you my secretary of the treasury. The time has now come and I want you to take that important position. You are the man for the place. Will you take it?"¹

Mr. Dingley thanked Mr. McKinley sincerely for the honor and said: "My dear governor, I have no desire for the position. I prefer my present place in the house. I think I can do you and your administration more service there."

1—"He was offered the position of secretary of the treasury by President McKinley and it is within my own personal knowledge that the president felt a great relief when he had brought his mind to the suggestion of his appointment, and I know it was a great grief and disappointment to him when Mr. Dingley declined the honor upon the ground of his impaired health. That he would have made a model secretary of the treasury, no man doubts. That it would have added any honor to him I cannot conceive." Hon. Chas. H. Grosvenor, of Ohio.

"I think not, governor," said the president-elect. "I am anxious to have you in my official family and I urge you to accept the place. You know I have the utmost confidence in you; and the whole country will approve my act."

Finally Mr. Dingley said: "Well, governor, I will take your tender into careful consideration and return answer in a few weeks."

On account of a severe cold, Mr. Dingley remained all night at the McKinley home. While here, absorbed in public matters of great moment, Mr. Dingley did not forget that this was the birthday of his dear wife. He wrote her a long letter of love and congratulation. The following day, after calling with Mr. McKinley on his aged mother, Mr. Dingley left for Washington, arriving there Saturday morning, December 5. At his rooms in the Hamilton house he was besieged all day long by newspaper reporters eager to talk with the man who had been offered the position of secretary of the treasury. To all alike, he declined to talk of the matter; but he was deeply touched by the compliments paid him by the members of the press in Washington who had learned to honor, respect and love him.¹

The second and last session of the fifty-fourth congress met Monday, December 7. The usual interesting scenes were enacted on the opening day. The desks of many members, including that of Mr. Dingley, were profusely decorated with flowers. Republicans and Democrats alike congratulated Mr. Dingley upon his probable selection as secretary of the treasury. Employes of the house who had formed a warm attachment for the Republican leader, ventured to add their modest congratulations. He held a veritable reception at his desk for an hour before congress met.

President Cleveland's message was conspicuous for what it did not say on the tariff. There was simply an apology for the tariff

1—The Washington correspondent to the Chicago Times Herald wrote: "He is not only one of the ablest men in the house, but is also one of the most admired and respected. During his long career in that body he has not made a single enemy, while it is also true that he has won the warm regard of his fellow legislators of all parties. The quality of his politics is healthy, and the philosophy of his statesmanship is profound. When he speaks both sides of the house listen, not because he is a great orator, but because what he says always adds wisdom to the situation."

The Washington correspondent of the Cleveland Plain Dealer wrote: "Mr. Dingley is a remarkable man. He gives no outward physical sign of the great ability he possesses. He has a face that utterly disguises his Anglo-Saxon blood, yet he is a Yankee of the Yankees, pure and undefiled. Free from all personal contact with trusts, from all corporations, from all banks and banking. Governor Dingley, a pronounced single standard gold man, will be the very strongest soul that Mr. McKinley can command, to carry out that idea successfully. The immense, overwhelming importance of having a man at the head of this great arm of the government who can act and make the fewest mistakes, is fully understood by Mr. McKinley. Mr. Dingley as such a man, has no rival in the Republican party."

House of Representatives U. S.,

Washington, D. C., Dec 22, 1886.

Hon Wm M. Stickley -

My Dear Governor:

I have been carefully considering your very kind request that I take the necessary Department under your administration, and have consulted with Mrs. Whipple, my physician and a few intimate friends in my District.

I have only been strengthened in the conviction which I expressed to you when the suggestion was made at Canton, that I can do more for the success of your administration where I am than in the drawing; and as, I said to you, my personal tastes are in the same direction.

In view of the fact that I want to do everything possible to make your administration a success - as I believe it will be, - and for that reason should feel inclined to subordinate my own personal preferences in order to respond to your own desires in a matter of this kind, I should have probably reluctantly replied in the affirmative to your request, if it had not been for the fact that a severe attack of Catarrh in

Handwritten text, possibly a title or header, mostly illegible due to fading.

RY

ducedly excessive out-of-door speaking in the Campaign has persistently continued and visibly affected my nervous system in consequence of which I have deemed it proper to consult my physician ~~as to~~ ^{as to} my probable physical ability - at any time of life to meet ~~the~~ continuous severe burdens imposed on the head of the Treasury in recent years - greatly increased by the business depression of the past three years; and he informs me that I should run a very serious risk of breaking down under such a load which has no season of relief, as is the case with my present position. And Mr. Dingley is so much impressed with the advice of my physician, and the present condition of my nervous system under the pressing attack of Catarrh, that he fears I would lose my life - as Manning and Madison did under the same burden, - if I should undertake the work of the Treasury.

In this situation, therefore, I feel constrained to decline the high honor which I feel it a nob. - which you propose to thrust on me, and which I can never accept, ~~because of my present infirmities, and as I regard it as too great an obligation to my~~ ^{because of my present infirmities, and as I regard it as too great an obligation to my} ~~to accept your wishes.~~ At the same time I assure you that you will have my hearty co-operation and assistance at all times in making your ~~present situation a great business~~ ^{present situation a great business} with the best wishes.

which he allowed to become a law without his signature. The executive ascribed the public deficit not to the tariff but to poor business. He did not allude to the free coinage of silver, but contented himself with urging the retirement of the greenbacks. On the Cuban question, the president was conservative, much to the relief of the whole country. He simply urged home rule for Cuba to be granted by Spain.

Mr. Dingley carefully and thoughtfully considered Mr. McKinley's tender of a cabinet position. He conferred with Speaker Reed and other party leaders, with his physicians and the members of his family. His catarrh not only troubled him but deprived him of sleep and disturbed his whole nervous system.

After a particularly restless night, he finally and irrevocably made up his mind; and on the morning of December 22nd wrote the following letter:

"Washington, D. C., December 22, 1896.

"Hon. William McKinley.—

"My Dear Governor: I have been carefully considering your very kind request that I take the treasury department under your administration, and have consulted with Mrs. Dingley, my physician and a few intimate friends in my district.

"I have only been strengthened in the conviction which I expressed to you when the suggestion was made at Canton, that I can do more for the success of your administration where I am than in the treasury, and as I said to you, my personal tastes are in the same direction.

"In view of the fact that I want to do everything possible to make your administration a success—as I believe it will be—and for that reason should feel inclined to subordinate my own personal preferences in order to respond to your own desires in a matter of this kind, I should have probably reluctantly replied in the affirmative to your request, if it had not been for the fact that a severe attack of catarrh induced by excessive out-of-door speaking in the campaign has persistently continued and visibly affected my nervous system, in consequence of which I have deemed it proper to consult my physician as to my probable physical ability at my time of life to meet the continuous severe burdens imposed on the head of the treasury in recent years—greatly increased by the business depressions of the past three years; and he informs me that I should run a very serious risk of breaking down under such a load which has no seasons of relief, as is the case with my present position. And Mrs. Dingley is so much impressed with the advice of my phy-

sician, and the present condition of my nervous system under the existing attack of catarrh, that she fears I would lose my life—as Manning and Windom did under the same burden—if I should undertake the work of the treasury.

"In this situation, therefore, I feel constrained to decline the high honor—for I feel it such—which you proposed to tender me, and for which I am under the deepest obligation to you. At the same time, I assure you that you will have my hearty co-operation and assistance at all times in making your administration a great success. With the best wishes, I remain,

"Sincerely yours,
"Nelson Dingley Jr."

Thus Mr. Dingley declined the office of secretary of the treasury. His letter was read by Mr. McKinley with deep regret; but he knew that under no circumstances could Mr. Dingley be induced to change his mind. Later he fully realized that Mr. Dingley was right when he said that he could help the administration and the country more as chairman of the ways and means committee than as secretary of the treasury.

This positive declination was not publicly known until January 7, when Mr. Dingley confirmed the report that he would not be secretary of the treasury. To the inquiries of friends and correspondents he said: "It is a matter of sincere regret that I cannot be intimately associated with the McKinley administration, for I believe it is going to be a successful administration. I would do as much for Governor McKinley as for any other man, but upon careful reflection, I cannot see my way to accept the treasury department." But in reluctantly declining this high honor, Mr. Dingley gave to the country his rare talents and ripe experience in the preparation of a protective tariff bill that arrested depression and restored material prosperity.

The preparation of the Dingley tariff bill began on the evening of December 10, twelve days before that important letter to Mr. McKinley was penned, when the republican members of the ways and means committee met in the committee room and voted "to begin a tariff bill and have it ready for an extra session of congress."

The committee on ways and means was first created July 24, 1789, in the first session of the first congress, and consisted of a member from each state. In the second session of the seventh congress, (December 15, 1802) the committee became one of the standing committees of the house. Until 1865 this committee con-

sidered and reported all appropriation bills. The membership of the committee has always been composed of the most distinguished members of the house. Among them have been, John Randolph, Millard Fillmore, Henry Clay, James K. Polk, Robert C. Winthrop, John C. Breckenridge, Henry Winter Davis, Justin S. Morrill, John Sherman, Israel Washburn, Thaddeus Stevens, James A. Garfield, Roscoe Conkling, William B. Allison, John A. Logan, William D. Kelly, Austin Blair, Henry L. Dawes, William R. Morrison, N. P. Banks, Roger Q. Mills, John G. Carlisle, William P. Frye, William McKinley, Thomas B. Reed, William L. Wilson, Julius C. Burrows, William M. Springer and William J. Bryan.

The room of the committee on ways and means in the National house in December 1896, when the preparation of the Dingley tariff bill was begun, was the largest and most commodious in the capitol. The library had about four thousand volumes covering very completely the subjects of tariff and finance. An open fireplace and inviting easy chairs, made this committee room a general reception room for those desiring private conferences with prominent members of congress. Chairman Dingley was sought after more than any other member of congress, unless it was the speaker; and he always received all with uniform courtesy. In the center of the room stood a large table around which were arranged 17 chairs. Along the edge of the table directly in front of each chair, was a small silver plate on which was engraved the name of the member of the committee occupying the seat. Chairman Dingley sat at the head of the table farthest from the door with Sereno E. Payne of New York on his right and John Dalzell of Pennsylvania on his left. The other members of the committee were: Albert J. Hopkins of Illinois, Charles H. Grosvenor of Ohio, Charles A. Russell of Connecticut, Jonathan P. Dolliver of Iowa, George W. Steele of Indiana, Martin N. Johnson of North Dakota, Walter Evans of Kentucky, James A. Tawney of Minnesota, Henry G. Turner of Georgia, Charles J. Boatner of Louisiana, Seth W. Cobb of Missouri, Benton McMillin of Tennessee, Joseph Wheeler of Alabama, and John L. McLaurin of South Carolina.


Mr. Dingley was 65 years old when he undertook the task of guiding to a successful consummation, the framing of the protective tariff bill of 1897, otherwise known as the Dingley bill. He possessed a mind logical in the highest degree. He had a wonderfully lucid way of asserting facts and of going at once to the heart of things. Apparently not of robust health, he was nevertheless of a wiry nature, capable of intense work without fatigue. He launched

upon his arduous task with a confidence and assurance born of long experience and close study. He had his subject well in hand and was able to do an enormous amount of work with comparative ease. In fact, while burdened with the responsibilities of his position and filled with the cares of legislation, this busy man found time to answer his little grandson's letters. In the course of one letter dated February 1st, written to his grandson, he said: "When you get to be a big boy we want you to come and visit us at Washington and we will show you the big white marble building in which congress meets and where grandpa works, and also the big white house in which the president lives."

The construction of a new tariff along the lines of protection and national income began.

The new tariff was not to be a copy of any previous economic legislation, because the American economic system was founded on a condition and theory, not a theory without regard to a condition. The protection of American wages was the basic idea of the American economic system. The trouble with the tariff of 1894 was that it discriminated against the agricultural and other important American interests, while giving fair protection to certain other domestic interests. The task of devising a tariff bill to stay a national deficit and adequately protect all American industry, was no holiday affair. But it was committed to experts, not novices. The capitalist was fast ascertaining that his profits should not come out of an abnormally strong position secured by the artifices of unscientific paternalism, but out of the exploitation of nature by machinery run by well paid help, protected by the law of humanity embodied in a tariff. The idea had gained a stronger position in this country year by year, that the American economic system gives to capital larger profits only by way of cheaper wealth and larger production. We have ascertained that advanced tools depend on advanced consumption, and advanced consumption on high wages. The promotion of wages and the standard of life is not sentimental philanthropy but scientific humanity, because it co-ordinates the interests of those who make to sell with those who buy to consume.

Mr. Dingley, in the course of a public statement said: "We should have at least fifty million dollars of revenues, and it would be better if the sum were seventy million. Besides, the treasury reserve should not be less than one hundred and fifty million dollars instead of the present limit of one hundred million dollars in gold. After July 1st there must be more revenue or serious difficulty will



MAINE'S BIG SIX.
WM. P. FRYE. EUGENE HALE.
NELSON DINGLEY JR. THOMAS B. REED.
CHARLES A. BOUTELLE. SETH L. MILLIKEN.

arise. Whatever is done should be done quickly for business reasons. As applied to politics, delay would be dangerous. There is only one plan to be followed—that is for President McKinley to call an extraordinary session of congress. It is my judgment that such a session need not be a long one, unless the senate purposely prolongs debate. If the two bodies composing congress confine themselves to the work in hand, six weeks ought to be sufficient for the house. There are objections to an extra session unless it becomes imperative, but there can be no doubt that the exigencies of the treasury are under that head. Part of the wave of confidence that has swept over the country since the result of the recent election became known, arises from the buoyant hopes of most of our industrial concerns that the existing tariff injustices, dangers and incongruities will be corrected. Our manufacturing interests are looking forward with the hope, in many cases born of desperation, of relief from the existing ills of the tariff system. We have now an opportunity to obtain from fifty to seventy million dollars additional revenue, and at the same time to build up some of our national industries which are now languishing. Protection is a principle—not a matter of rates. The house of representatives will maintain the principle of protection but with justice and moderation.”

The series of tariff hearings by the committee on ways and means began December 28 and closed January 11. The committee room was crowded at every hearing, and representatives of all the leading lines of industry were present. Chairman Dingley presided over these hearings, listening to and commenting on the mass of testimony.

Wednesday, January 13, the republican members of the committee began the framing of the tariff bill, in rooms they had engaged at the Cochran hotel, immediately opposite the Hamilton house,—centrally located and convenient to the chairman.

It took two weeks and two days to complete the first draft of the Dingley tariff bill, and get the printed copies ready for congress. The republican members of the committee worked almost uninterruptedly during this period in the preparation of the bill. It was a tremendous task. Schedule by schedule, paragraph by paragraph, the entire bill was constructed with great care and precision. Mr. Dingley was the guiding spirit,¹ all yielding to his

1—"Gov. Dingley was largely the stimulating and controlling influence. The review of the work, however, discloses to all who participated in it, or were in any way acquainted with it, the remarkable ability, the conscientious application and the unselfish disposition which Governor Dingley possessed. It disclosed further the grasp of industrial situations and the necessities and the pur-

judgment, knowledge and tact. During these conferences various interests often clashed, but the chairman was always ready with some compromise or plan of procedure that seemed to satisfy all. With rare shrewdness he succeeded in adjusting all differences and in harmonizing the several parts of this important measure. His associates had implicit confidence in him and regarded him as students regard a wise and noble instructor.

Many amusing events transpired during the preliminary preparation of the Dingley tariff bill, some of them at the expense of the chairman, who was always so absorbed in the seriousness of his work as to forget the humorous side of life. Mr. Dingley, it is related, was very anxious to have a duty on kindling wood. Most of the members associated kindling wood with their wood piles at their back doors and were inclined to poke fun at the chairman. They were not aware of the fact that in many of the northern states there was a regular industry of manufacturing kindling wood and putting it on the market in bundles. Mr. Dingley proceeded to argue in favor of a duty on this article and took seriously the objections raised by some of the members who objected in a spirit of pure fun. But the duty on kindling wood was agreed to.

Shortly afterwards, Mr. Tawney of Minnesota, became interested in a duty on enameled shoe strings. So one morning he asked to have the schedule which he had prepared, considered by the Republican members. The chairman, who was overwhelmed with requests and anxious to complete the first draft of the bill, said, perhaps with some haste: "We have no time now for such trifling matters." Mr. Tawney with more spirit than he now wishes he had displayed, replied: "Mr. Chairman, I think shoe strings are as important as kindling wood." The other members including the chairman joined in a hearty laugh and proceeded to consider other sections of the bill.

Chairman Dingley sat at the head of the table, Mr. Payne on his right and Mr. Dalzell on his left. These three men were the Republican triumvirate in the preparation of the first draft of the bill. So great was the chairman's confidence in the judgment of these two men, that he unconsciously conferred with them alone, and in a low voice on the rates to be agreed upon, and in a quiet way would say: "If there is no objection it will be the sense of the committee that the rate of duty on such and such an article shall be so and so."

pose of dealing with them broadly, patriotically and equitably, which were the lines on which the Dingley tariff law was drawn." Hon. Chas. A. Russell of Connecticut.

Some of the younger Republican members of the committee at the foot of the table, while having implicit confidence in the chairman and his two leading associates, conspired to play a mild joke on the chairman. They agreed to object and vote down the chairman on some minor matter the next time the chairman talked in a low tone to Messrs. Payne and Dalzell, and put the question. The three heads came together in close consultation and the chairman in his accustomed manner without looking up from the table said: "If there is no objection the committee will agree upon a duty of 60 per cent." Mr. Tawney said: "Mr. Chairman, we object and ask for a vote." "Well, well," said the chairman, looking over the top of his eye glasses with a surprised look on his face,—“of course we can take a vote if it is so desired.” “We desire it,” said Mr. Tawney. The vote was taken and the motion defeated, much to the chairman’s amazement. The mischievous members of the committee laughed and explained their joke with the suggestion that the triumvirate occasionally take cognizance of the physical presence of the other Republican members.

When the hosiery schedule was under consideration, Mr. Steele of Indiana, was suddenly called from the room; and upon returning inquired as to the progress made and was informed that the schedule had been completed. “Well,” he said, wearily, “having disposed of the sock question we will now proceed to other topics.”

When the matter of imposing a duty on Angora goat hair was completed the chairman heaved a sigh of relief and said: “There, that disposes of the goat.” “Yes,” said Mr. Dolliver, “but the importers in six months will make another goat.”

Mr. Dingley’s accurate knowledge of tariff schedules, rates and classifications was the marvel of his associates; and of all who conferred with him relative to proposed duties. His mind was a reservoir of facts and figures which he marshaled as a general marshals his soldiers—by companies and battalions. Thousands of suggestions, verbally and by letter were given him, and figures and percentages and claims were presented until any ordinary mind would have been hopelessly confused. But from this mass he was able to discern unerringly the true and the false, and to pluck out the kernel of the whole thing. His parlor at the Hamilton house was the headquarters of all interested in tariff legislation. His desks and tables were covered with books, papers, pads with figures, official documents and newspapers. Experts in certain lines of business called upon him to make suggestions, and were amazed to learn

that the chairman of the committee knew all about their particular industry—the process of manufacture and the technical terms.

Mr. Dingley was seriously troubled with catarrh throughout the winter and the arduous labors incident to the preparation of a tariff bill told on him. He looked careworn and at times pale. He was continually wrapped in deep thought, oblivious of his surroundings and almost unconscious of what he ate, or what he wore. When in his private parlor, he was either figuring on a piece of paper, watching the fire abstractedly and trimming his whiskers with a pair of pocket scissors, or pacing the floor and humming some familiar tune in a half audible tone. All this gave evidence of his supreme appreciation of the serious problem before him and the great responsibility that rested on his shoulders. The whole country was awaiting his action and looking to him for relief. It was the crisis of his public career. But with a wonderful mental equipoise and a conscious confidence in his own powers, he faced the work before him. Fortunately he was an excellent sleeper; and at 10 o'clock or thereabouts, he laid aside his work and in half an hour was sleeping peacefully. This happy faculty of throwing off cares at bed-time was the only thing that sustained him during these months of work and anxiety.


While preparing with his associates the first draft of the tariff bill, Mr. Dingley did not attend the sessions of the house regularly. February 10, he went to the house for the first time for nearly a month and was loudly cheered as he took his seat. On that day the electoral votes were counted and Mr. McKinley declared elected president. That evening Mr. Dingley attended a dinner at Senator Morrill's with the members of the senate committee on finance. Here the plan of operation was settled upon—the date of the meeting of congress in extra session—the length of debate in the house and the probable date for the final passage of the bill.

Mr. Dingley was sixty-five years old on the 15th day of February. It was a marvel to his associates¹ how he could endure so

1—Mr. Dolliver, one of his colleagues said: "For many months prior to the extraordinary session of congress, Mr. Dingley sat at the head of the table surrounded by the ten members of the ways and means committee, belonging to his own party, conducting the investigations which resulted in the original draft of the Dingley tariff bill. They were months of labor, without a day of recreation and without an hour of leisure. The chairman of the committee, even then to all appearances, frail and uncertain in strength, brought to the business in hand that wealth of accurate information, that vast store of definite knowledge, that unflinching zeal of personal attention which left his colleagues in daily astonishment, as they came to see the fulness of his equipment in the field of practical legislation. The minute details of previous legislation from the first tariff law to the last, and the history of American industries, great and small, including the vicissitudes of the business world seemed to be within easy reach of his infallible memory, so that he could not be deceived by the petitions of those who sought to reduce them to a point unnecessarily low. In this be-



NATIONAL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



much uninterrupted mental labor, work all day and far into the night over schedules, figures and percentages, and not break down. Having the appearance of an invalid, and lacking that physical vigor which seemed essential to success in the political arena, Mr. Dingley so regulated his work and so conserved his energy as to outstrip all in mental endurance.

On the 26th of February the senate bill for the creation of an international monetary conference was being considered in the house. The position of the Republican party on this important matter had not been publicly taken since the declaration in the St. Louis platform was written. While the discussion was in progress, Mr. Dingley entered the hall and took his seat. His appearance on the floor aroused the Republicans to unusual interest, for the floor leader did not attend the sessions unless something important was being considered. As he rose to speak¹ there was a hush all over the house; and in unmistakable language he pronounced the attitude of the party. His words thrilled the members, and there was an outburst of applause at the conclusion of nearly every sentence. He advocated the passage of the bill first, because of the pledge of the Republican party, and second, because its defeat would result in injury to the sound money cause. The bill was passed by practically a unanimous vote.

President-elect William McKinley reached Washington March 2nd. Mr. Dingley called on him shortly after his arrival and paid his respects to the incoming executive. The inauguration of the president March 4th was a memorable occasion. Mr. Dingley, modest and retiring, witnessed the inauguration ceremonies and shared with the incoming president the responsibilities of the hour. The president's inaugural address was well received by the whole country. It recommended a restoration of protection; a monetary conference, and economy in public affairs. From his parlors, Mr. Dingley viewed the long and imposing procession in the afternoon and the display of fireworks in the evening. His thoughts, however, were dwelling upon the tariff bill. That evening he discussed with his family and a party of friends the proposed tariff bill—what

wildering mass of statistics, official reports, price lists and personal statements, Mr. Dingley moved about like a man peerfectly at home, never failing to get at the facts; never hesitating to cast aside hearsay from whatever quarter; and when the work was over and the bill approved by the house without an amendment not suggested by the committee, every man associated with him, in addition to admiration for the statesman, found in his heart a sincere affection for the man himself, for the unostentatious colleague whose greatness as a leader only emphasized his kindness and generosity as a friend."

1—See Appendix.

he expected it would accomplish and what it would do for the country. His conversation was delightful and inspiring.

The following day he rested in his rooms and on March 6th with his republican associates resumed the work of framing the tariff bill. The following week, from Monday morning until Saturday night, he labored almost incessantly on the details of the bill. The strain was terrific, and when Saturday night came and the first print of the bill was received, he was exhausted. But even Sunday afforded him no real rest. It was the eve of the extraordinary session of the 55th congress.

Saturday, March 6th, President McKinley issued his proclamation calling congress to assemble in extra session March 15. This had been anticipated for some time—in fact the date was determined by the probable completion of the tariff bill.

The house of representatives was crowded long before noon March 15. Admission was by ticket alone. The audience in the galleries saw the most extraordinary display of flowers ever brought into the chamber.

After the election of Mr. Reed as speaker, the interesting process of choosing seats began. Mr. Wadsworth of New York, whose name was called early in the drawing of seats, courteously surrendered his seat to Mr. Dingley, while Mr. Wilson of Brooklyn, who had a seat one row nearer the front, and who was not to be outdone in generosity, then changed with Mr. Dingley, bringing the Republican leader into a very desirable position, four seats from the front. President McKinley's short message was listened to with marked attention. It was devoted exclusively to the tariff, and the deficit under the Wilson law. "With the unlimited means at our command," he said, "we are presenting the remarkable spectacle of increasing a public debt by borrowing money to meet the ordinary outlays incident upon even an economical and prudent administration of the government. Not only are we without a surplus in the treasury, but, with an increase in the public debt, there has been a corresponding increase in the interest charged. Congress should promptly correct the existing conditions. Ample revenues must be supplied not only for the ordinary expenses of the government, but for the prompt payment of liberal pensions and the liquidation of the principal and interest of the public debt. * * * The imperative demand of the hour is the prompt enactment of such a measure, and to this object I earnestly recommend that congress should make every endeavor."

The president's message was received with applause, but the climax of the day's memorable events was reached, when Mr. Dingley, standing in his place in the house, rose and "in response to the message which has just been read," introduced the Dingley tariff bill. ¹ The Republican leader was loudly cheered, while handkerchiefs were waved in the galleries above. The modest man from Maine, who through years of hard toil and study had, round by round climbed the ladder of fame, now stood in the national house of representatives the central figure in a great nation. It was indeed, an hour of triumph; but in the midst of the applause and cheers he stood unmoved, apparently oblivious of himself.

The speaker immediately appointed the members of the committee on ways and means—Messrs. Dingley, Payne, Dalzell, Hopkins, Grosvenor, Russell, Dolliver, Steele, Johnson, Evans, Tawney, Bailey, McMillin, Wheeler, McLaurin, Robertson and Swanson. The full committee organized and began the consideration of the tariff bill the following day.

Chairman Dingley made a statement to the public respecting the provisions and probable effects of the new tariff bill. He said: "The bill has two purposes, namely, to raise additional revenue, and to encourage the industries of the United States. On the basis of the importations of the last fiscal year, the bill will increase the revenue about one hundred and twelve million dollars. The deduction of revenue due to anticipatory importations will leave a probable increased revenue for the first year of about seventy-five million dollars, and for the second year about one hundred million dollars. The estimates are below the probable result, unless a con-

1—"It was only lacking a few minutes of 12 o'clock when the slight figure of Gov. Dingley was seen to enter the hall from the lobby door at the right of the speaker's desk. He entered as he did everything else, quietly, and his countenance bore that usual grave and thoughtful, but not unpleasant, expression. His entrance seemed to be the first expected event of the session and was quickly noted and he was recognized with applause on the floor and in the galleries. As he briskly walked across the semi-circle in front of the speaker's desk and up the aisle to the left of the center to the seat he had conspicuously occupied in the previous congress it was generally observed that he carried under his left arm a package enveloped in brown paper—a package of considerable size and suggestive of importance as bearing upon the purpose for which the congress was about to assemble. Almost immediately there was a murmur on the floor, 'There's the bill.' I shall always retain most vividly in memory this appearance of Gov. Dingley; his recognition by those assembled in the hall of the house of representatives on that memorable Monday and the scenes of the accomplishment of benefit to our country and the people which at that moment seemed to pervade the atmosphere of the place. * * * The interest which had signalized Gov. Dingley's entrance into the house was intensified when he arose to address the members. He seemed modestly oblivious to that interest and there was as usual in his action the absence of any pose or dramatic bearing, calculated to draw to himself or the occasion unusual show or uncommon remark. On this occasion, perhaps the most important in which he had figured, he seemed to shrink from the notoriety of the incident and to be bent on the purpose only of quietly and effectively doing the business in hand." Hon. Chas. A. Russell, of Connecticut.

siderable delay in the enactment of the bill should greatly enlarge the opportunity for imports of articles on which duties are to be raised. Undoubtedly any delay beyond the first of May in placing the bill upon the statute books would result in a large loss of revenue. In framing this new tariff the aim has been to make the duties specific, or at least partly specific, so far as possible, to protect the revenue and also to protect our own industries. It is a wise policy to encourage home production and manufacture, and thus provide employment at good wages for the laborers of our people, upon whose purchasing power depends the market for our products."

The tariff bill was, on the whole, favorably received by the Republicans and the protection newspapers. The prompt work of Chairman Dingley and his associates was heartily commended. The party had undertaken to redeem its pledge made at St. Louis—the restoration of protection. President McKinley and the other Republican leaders had implicit faith in Mr. Dingley and left everything to him. It was a tremendous responsibility which this physically frail man faced, but he did not flinch.

The settlement of the sugar schedule in the preparation of the first draft of the Dingley tariff bill was a vexed problem. The McKinley tariff placed raw sugar on the free list, and provided for the payment of a bounty in order to encourage a few struggling domestic sugar industries. It was charged that the sugar schedule in the tariff of 1894 was arranged for the benefit of the sugar trust. Therefore the public was more than usually interested in the action of the Republican members of the ways and means committee on the sugar schedule.

December 28, Chairman Dingley received the following personal letter from John E. Searles, secretary and treasurer of the American Sugar Refining company:

117 Wall St., New York, December 28, 1896.
Hon. Nelson Dingley Jr., Chairman,

Washington, D. C.

My Dear Sir:

I note in the public prints the schedule of hearings on tariff questions and that an opportunity will be given on the 30th inst. to representatives of the sugar industry to present their views regarding the tariff on sugar. A public hearing of the character proposed will not furnish the opportunity for a full and careful discussion of this many-sided question. If agreeable to you, I should be very glad of an opportunity to confer with you on the subject at your convenience, after the public hearings are over and when you are in

possession of the information they may furnish. Awaiting your pleasure in the matter, I remain,

Yours very respectfully,

John E. Searles, Treasurer.

American Sugar Refining Co.

The following day Mr. Dingley replied as follows:

Washington, D. C., December 29, 1896.

John E. Searles, Esq.,

Dear Sir:

I am in receipt of your note of yesterday relative to the duty on sugar. We should be pleased to receive from you a statement from the refiners' point of view covering both the question of duty on raw sugar and on the refined product, and presenting such facts as will aid the committee in revising the sugar schedule. This statement should be presented by the middle of next week in order that we may have it printed for the use of the committee. Should any explanation further be required the committee will be pleased to call upon you and other refiners hereafter.

Yours truly,

Nelson Dingley Jr., Chairman.

Mr. Dingley thus declined to give the representative of the American Sugar Refining company a private hearing. This corporation had no better opportunity to present its case than any other corporation or private individual. All conferences and all arguments were in public. The so-called sugar trust had nothing to do with the framing of the original sugar schedule of the Dingley tariff bill. The refusal of Chairman Dingley to fix a higher differential duty on refined sugar in the new bill was bitterly resented by the American Sugar Refining company. Every effort was made to force Mr. Dingley to accede to the wishes of the refiners; but Mr. Dingley insisted upon a specific duty to insure the actual collection of the duty. The duty on sugar was increased for the purposes of revenue and to encourage the production of sugar in the United States, and the duty was made specific instead of ad valorem.

On the 18th of March the ways and means committee by a party vote ordered the chairman to report the tariff bill. That evening before the fire in his private apartments at the Hamilton house, Mr. Dingley with remarkable speed, wrote with a pencil on a pad, the famous report which accompanied the tariff bill on the following day. In this report, Mr. Dingley pointed out that "for nearly four years the revenue has been inadequate to meet the current expenditures and pay the interest on the war debt. This clearly justifies the


convention of congress to devise a prompt and adequate remedy. Nearly two hundred and three million dollars of the two hundred and ninety-three million dollars of borrowed gold have been used to supply an insufficiency of revenue." He showed how the tariff of 1890 was practically nullified by anticipated reduction of duties in 1892 and 1893. He added that "an imperative duty resting on this congress is to so adjust duties in a revision of the tariff as to secure needed revenue to carry on the government and to protect the many industries which have so seriously suffered in the past three years from unequal foreign competition, and from the consequent loss of purchasing power of the masses of the people upon which the demand for products and the prosperity of every citizen depends."

Mr. Dingley was loudly applauded when on the following day he reported the tariff bill to the house. It was agreed to begin debate March 22 and to have the final vote March 31.

The memorable tariff debate of 1897 began March 22, Mr. Dingley opening the discussion for the Republicans. The galleries were crowded with visitors and every member was in his seat as the Republican leader on the floor began his speech. When Mr. Dingley rose, the house was all attention and the noise of conversation ceased. A whole nation was listening to this modest man from Maine. Dressed in an ordinary black frock coat, his thin hair combed over his high and intellectual forehead, his face bearing the unmistakable marks of a student, and his shoulders having a distinct scholar's stoop, Mr. Dingley was the central figure in this national drama. He began speaking in a low tone, but so unusually quiet were the members that every word could be distinctly heard. He was not an orator, but the house listened attentively and respectfully as he proceeded with his luminous statement of the provisions of the bill and the reasons why it should be enacted into law. After calling attention to the chronic deficiency of revenue, he declared that "our problem is to provide adequate revenue from duties on imports to carry on the government and to provide more abundant opportunities for our labor." He caused great laughter by saying that "we have been attending a kindergarten on a gigantic scale. The tuition has come high, but no people ever learned so much in so brief a time." He predicted that the additional revenue the first year, provided the bill should become a law by May 1, would reach seventy-five million dollars. For the second year he believed the proposed bill would yield one hundred



ROOM OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.



million dollars of increased revenue. He spoke ¹ for an hour, and was greeted with long continued applause. It was the beginning of an important epoch in the history of the country.

March 26 debate on the tariff bill began under the five minute rule, and here Mr. Dingley displayed his rare tact, skill and judgment in rejecting mischievous amendments. The Democrats attacked the bill at every point and sought to discredit it before the people. There was much confusion and lack of united action among the Democrats, while the Republicans presented a solid and united front. During this running debate, which lasted five days, Mr. Dingley was constantly at his post watching with more than his usual sharpness and shrewdness, the movements of the opponents of the measure. On questions of facts and figures, percentages, tariff history and party record, he was infallible. His statements were not questioned. He met the objections of the tariff-for-revenue-only men; the incidental-protection men; the low-tariff men and the absolute free traders. His logic was unanswerable—his conclusions irresistible. He was in short, complete master of the situation. In the midst of ridicule, scorn, sharp stories and catch-questions he was calm, cool and collected. Like a general on the field of battle he directed and guided and led the Republican majority. He was on his feet speaking briefly many times a day. He was the master spirit. Party feeling ran high during the last days of the debate, and political speeches were wedged in at every opportunity. And there were constant manoeuvrings for political advantage; but Mr. Dingley kept his forces unbroken. On the 30th and 31st, several amendments offered by the committee on ways and means were adopted—all others rejected. The Democratic minority assaulted the Republican lines again and again but Mr. Dingley parried all attacks with consummate skill. His superior knowledge of parliamentary law saved the bill from temporary defeat at many points.

Long before the house met on the last day of March, the corridors and lobbies of the capitol were thronged with eager spectators, anxious to secure admission to the house at any cost. The galleries were crowded when Speaker Reed called the members to order. The last few hours of the debate were the most exciting of all. Mr. Grosvenor of Ohio offered an amendment putting into operation immediately the rates provided in the bill. The intention was to prevent an excess of importations while the measure was pending in the senate. A point of order was made that the

1—See Appendix.

amendment had not been considered by the ways and means committee. This point being sustained, the chairman at once summoned his committee together, and a few minutes later the proposition was again in the house and was adopted. Mr. Dockery of Missouri sought to nullify the whole bill by offering an amendment placing all so-called "trust-made" articles on the free list. Mr. Dingley did not even raise a point of order against this, but immediately demanded the previous question on the amendment which was ordered, and without debate or explanation it was voted down.

Mr. Dingley then took the floor and closed the debate in a ten minute speech. In calm words, he spoke of the extraordinary circumstances which produced the exigency congress had been called upon in extra session to meet. The ways and means committee, he said, had labored faithfully for months to adjust duties to present conditions. There might be some little dissatisfaction with rates; but he assured his colleagues and the country that he felt confident the bill would accomplish the purpose for which it was framed.¹

When the gavel fell at exactly three o'clock the Republicans gave their leader a ringing round of applause which was taken up by the galleries. It continued for several minutes. The house passed the bill by a vote of 205 to 122, 21 present and not voting. Not once were the Republican lines broken. The rumored impending disaffection failed to materialize. On the other hand five Democrats, three from Louisiana, and two from Texas, especially interested in sugar, broke from their party and voted for the bill. So did one Populist, Mr. Howard, of Alabama. Speaker Reed gave a dramatic climax to the ten days struggle in the house by directing his name to be called.

"Mr. Reed," shouted the clerk.

"Aye," said the speaker, in tones equally audible, and the Republicans applauded vigorously. When, a moment later, it was announced that the bill had passed, the Republicans rose en masse and cheered their leader. The crowds in the galleries joined in the demonstration. Hearty congratulations were showered on Mr. Dingley. It was an hour of triumph.

Thus, after three months of hard labor, Mr. Dingley and his associates saw the result of their labors approved by the Republicans of the house.

One of the wonders connected with the passage of the bill was the amount of work that Mr. Dingley was able to do, and live. Be-

1—Amos J. Cummings in a letter wrote: "Governor Dingley's opening and closing was cool, impassionate and argumentative. The Republicans hung upon his utterances as if spellbound."

ginning early in December with preparation for the hearings, then two weeks of hearings beginning December 28, then day and night sessions of the Republican members, a season of constant unremitting brain-destroying and body-wearying toil, beset with throngs of representatives of various conflicting interests; and to come out of it all apparently in better trim, in body and mind, than when the enormous task was begun—this was one of the most astonishing facts in connection with the formulation of the Dingley tariff bill. During the exciting debates on some of the paragraphs, Mr. Dingley was compelled to meet with what appeared to be serious opposition in his own ranks; but such was his skill and diplomacy, that he succeeded in quieting all discontent. Many Republican members who openly differed with the chairman, followed him out of personal love and devotion. His control over his colleagues was marvelous. As the leader of his side of the house, he was a success.

It is needless to say that Mr. Dingley was greatly relieved at the successful conclusion of the tariff struggle in the house. He rested in his rooms the following day, and on the evening of April 1st, dined with President McKinley and other invited guests at the White House. Here the exciting incidents of the past few months were rehearsed and plans laid for the future. On the evening of April 3rd, the Republican members of the ways and means committee gave Mr. Dingley a complimentary dinner. It was a rare occasion, where the modest chairman was showered with compliments and good wishes.

The news of the passage of the tariff bill by the house was favorably received by a large majority of the newspapers, manufacturers and business men. Mr. Dingley received messages and letters from all over the country congratulating him and the Republican party.

CHAPTER XXII.

1897.

While the senate was struggling with the tariff bill, the house rested. Mr. Dingley sought recreation by visiting the battlefield of Gettysburg, the naval academy at Annapolis, a Zeta Psi banquet in New York city, and the Grant memorial exercises on the banks of the Hudson. The house reconvened May 3rd and was at once plunged into a controversy with the speaker over the failure to appoint committees. Mr. Dingley sought to save the time of the house by protesting against Mr. Simpson's remarks, whereupon the member from Kansas characterized the Republican leader as "one of the dependants of plutocracy, who was hastening to defend the interests of his friends." The house decided that the speaker and Mr. Dingley were right, and Mr. Simpson subsided with a parting growl about the "brutal majority."

On the morning of the sixth of May, the president's carriage drove up in front of the Hamilton house, and a message was sent to Mr. Dingley's rooms that the president desired to confer with him. Mr. Dingley put on his hat and coat and was driven off in company with the chief executive, in the direction of the Soldier's Home. It was a very warm day, and the president chose this method of advising with the Republican leader in the house. Speaker Reed had never conferred with the president nor the president with Speaker Reed, since the president took up his residence in the White House. If the president desired to obtain the views of the speaker and the other house leaders, he conferred with Mr. Dingley.

The changes in the house tariff bill ¹ proposed by the senate, were topics of public comment by the tenth of May; and on the following day Mr. Dingley made a public statement. Among other things he said: "While the amendments to the house bill recommended to the senate finance committee (about 700) appear to be multitudinous, yet about 200 of them are mainly verbal. There are however, many amendments which are important, not only on revenue but other grounds. The fact that the senate finance committee recommend an ad valorem duty on sugar apparently a little higher than the specific duty of the house bill does not insure a larger revenue, as past experience with ad valorem duties has shown." Mr. Dingley called attention to the fact that the committee on ways and means had predicted a large falling off in revenue under the house bill, if the bill did not become a law by May 1. He expressed much disappointment at the delay which was resulting in large importations. There was much public comment on the action of the senate in substituting ad valorem for specific duties on sugar.

Mr. Dingley stoutly defended the house bill and its provisions, publishing in the New York Independent an able article in which he replied to some of his critics. ²

During the last week in May one of Mr. Dingley's sons and a granddaughter visited him in Washington. On the last day of the month he called on President and Mrs. McKinley, and with manifest pride introduced his small granddaughter to the executive and his wife. Mrs. McKinley received the congressman's granddaughter with extreme cordiality, saying: "You know I have no little girls of my own." That same day Mr. Dingley also presented his granddaughter to Speaker Reed. The speaker was exceedingly fond of his colleague, but never lost an opportunity to joke him; and the governor's evident pride gave Mr. Reed another chance.

"Governor," drawled Mr. Reed, with a twinkle in his eye, "I have for the first time discovered a flaw in your character and I must confess you have fallen in my estimation. I perceive that you are consumed with pride. Take my advice, governor, and correct it." And the speaker's sides shook with laughter. Mr. Dingley

1—There was great fun at the Gridiron club dinner in Washington. A huge scroll was brought in labeled "The Dingley tariff bill," and a member was instructed to take it over to the senate. When the member returned with his bill it was in shreds; his coat was torn, and his hat was battered into an unrecognizable shape. The member simply but eloquently reported back to the house: "Mr. Speaker, I have been there." President McKinley, Speaker Reed and Mr. Dingley witnessed this burlesque and were convulsed with laughter.

2—See Appendix.

joined in the merriment but made no comment, for he knew the speaker's weakness, which was manifested on other occasions. Mr. Dingley was exceedingly fond of apples and cider. There happened to be a place on Pennsylvania avenue, about four squares from the capitol grounds, where cider was made fresh every day. Nothing but cider and apples were sold there, and yet the place looked like a bar room. Mr. Dingley discovered this place and began to stop there occasionally to get a glass of sweet cider. As the story goes, one day some of Mr. Dingley's friends, including Speaker Reed, discovered the former in there drinking a glass of cider. The speaker told of the incident as a joke; the story was published broadcast in the newspapers and Mr. Dingley was very much annoyed. He failed to see the funny side of it.

The senate began consideration of the tariff bill May 25, Senator Aldrich opening the debate. While this discussion was proceeding, Mr. Dingley decided to make a flying visit to Maine and secure a short rest in the pine woods. In company with his wife, President and Mrs. McKinley and others, he went to Philadelphia June 2, where he attended a banquet given by the Manufacturers' club. President McKinley's address on this occasion was full of wisdom. "A tariff bill half made," he said, "is of no practical use except to indicate that in a little while a whole tariff law will be done; and it is making progress. It is reaching the end and when the end comes we shall have confidence and industrial activity."

Mr. Dingley received marked attention while in Philadelphia. Two days later, in company with his good wife, he was once more at home. June 7 they went to Rangeley lakes on a short fishing trip, returning three days later. The happy couple celebrated their fortieth wedding anniversary June 11. Mr. Dingley's father and his beloved brother Frank, together with a son and daughter helped to make the occasion merry. "These forty years have been happy ones!" he recorded in his diary. June 15 he returned alone to Washington to be ready for the tariff bill as it came from the senate. He resumed his duties much rested after his hard winter's work.

While debate was dragging along in the senate, impositions of wool, tobacco, sugar, and all kinds of manufactured goods, the duty on which was to be raised, increased enormously. Customs revenues increased far beyond the receipts of the preceding year. The senate gradually receded from many of its amendments to the original house bill. It surrendered its proposed ad valorem duty on sugar and restored the specific duty of the house with a seven

and a half cents per hundred increase on refined sugar. The closing debate on the sugar schedule gave the Democrats an opportunity to charge that the sugar trust had dictated the sugar schedule. Mr. Dingley's only comment was: "The house conferees will do their best to secure the retention of the original house schedule."

One day the members of the committee on ways and means were gathered in the committee room. It was after the tariff bill had run the gauntlet of the senate and had been amended rather freely. It is needless to say that the members of the committee were not pleased with it. During the conversation, Speaker Reed sauntered in and stood listening. As usual, Mr. Dingley was busy at his work, taking no part in the universal clamor against the senate, although he was the one most concerned. Finally Mr. Reed spoke up and drawled: "Governor, I've been here ten minutes and I've heard Dalzell and Tawney and Dolliver swear and most of the rest of them swear. Governor, won't you please swear a little? We shall need you very much, governor, where we are going. Dingley," continued the speaker, "you're too good. There's such a thing as average goodness, and you have run it up so high in this congress that I know six members who lay their ruin to your door for making it so hard to bring the average down to the proper level"

From the eighteenth to the twenty-ninth of June, Mr. Dingley together with Mr. Payne and Mr. Dalzell, the "tariff triumvirate" as they were called, examined the senate amendments to the house bill. These three men, it was thought, would be the conferees on the part of the house. Thus the work in conference was anticipated several days. It was decided to stand by the house bill, particularly the sugar schedule. Mr. Dingley thought this was of great importance and his ideas prevailed—in fact, Mr. Payne and Mr. Dalzell, able men themselves, yielded respectful deference to Mr. Dingley's views. Mr. Dingley said that the house sugar schedule gave the domestic refiner twelve and one-half cents protection on each one hundred pounds of refined sugar, while the senate raised this protection to twenty cents. "In fact," said Mr. Dingley, "the discussion in the senate shows that even many grave senators fail to comprehend the question."

The three months discussion of the Dingley tariff bill in the senate, cost the United States treasury \$200,000 a day. Therefore the whole country was rejoiced, when, on the seventh of June, the bill (amended) passed the senate by a vote of 38 to 28. The senate asked for a conference and Messrs. Allison, Aldrich, Platt, Bur-

rows, Jones of Nevada, Vest, Jones of Arkansas, and White were appointed conferees on the part of the senate. On the following day Mr. Dingley moved that the house non-concer in the senate amendments to the tariff bill. A conference was agreed to and Messrs. Dingley, Payne, Dalzell, Hopkins, Grosvenor, Bailey, McMillin, and Wheeler were appointed conferees on the part of the house. The Republican members were made five instead of three at Mr. Dingley's suggestion.

The conferees met that same afternoon in the room of the senate finance committee and in the evening the Republican members met at Mr. Grosvenor's residence.¹ The conferences of the Republican members were continued for four days in the finance committee room with satisfactory results. The conferees spent eleven hours each day in conference. It was a notable gathering of statesmen and both houses of congress, as well as the whole country awaited the result with intense interest.


The practical triumph of Mr. Dingley's principles and the climax of his success was in this conference committee in which he prevailed by his great knowledge of the subject and his unique hold upon the details of the bill.² One incident is called to mind in relation to Mr. Dingley that illustrates not only his cleverness, but also his peculiar humor and his control of the situation. In the great mass of inconsequential amendments to the bill, as it passed the senate, no single amendment was of more interest or made a greater amount of public comment than the senate amendment to the word "asbestos" which that august body changed to "asbestus" to the great amusement of the public.

1—"In the management of his great life work, the Dingley tariff law of to-day, upon the floor of the house no man ever exhibited higher elements of leadership. He had worked in the committee room at the Cochran hotel all winter long, by day and by night upon every detail of that bill. While others slept, he worked. While others went the round of Washington life, he delved and figured. He was the first man in his seat at the council table in the morning and the last one to leave it at night. I shall always believe that much of the trouble that came to him and which terminated his valuable life was caused by his incessant labor during the winter of 1896-7 and in the struggle in congress which did not terminate until way in mid summer. I served with him on the conference committee that had in charge the Dingley tariff bill with the senate amendments. His conduct was the illustration of genius. His power to meet and answer the arguments of those holding other and different views from him was wonderful. His patience and long suffering were admirable and in the end the members of that conference committee came out of that conference room with an estimate of the character and ability of Nelson Dingley Jr., far greater and more complimentary to him than when they had entered it." Hon Chas. H. Grosvenor of Ohio.

2—"When the Dingley bill was in conference between the two houses, the ability and information of Mr. Dingley were quite as apparent as they were among the members of the ways and means committee and it was to his wise statesmanship in a large measure that can be attributed the success of the conference and the agreement of the conference committee upon the provisions of the bill as they are now found in the law." Hon. A. J. Hopkins of Illinois.



NELSON DINGLEY JR.,
CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE.



In the course of business the conferees came to the word "asbestos."

"We are now approaching," said Congressman Dingley, "a most important amendment, possibly the most important on the list. I refer to the word asbestos."

At this the members of the committee all looked at Senator Allison.

"Senator Allison," said Mr. Dingley, with a twinkle in his eye, "what do you understand to be the derivation of the word asbestos? Do you consider that it came from the Greek—" and here Mr. Dingley gave the derivation which he had carefully ascertained.

Senator Allison was not a student of Greek. He knew less of Greek than of anything else on the curriculum of the United States senator.

"Dingley," said Allison, "I am sick of this word asbestos. I don't know anything about it. I don't want to have anything to do with it. Let's call it done. Let's settle that forever."

"All right," said Mr. Dingley, amid the roars of laughter from the committee. "I'll tell you what I'll do. There's one cent a pound on mackerel that you took off in the senate. You give me the cent on mackerel and I'll give you your spelling of the word asbestos."

On the fourteenth of January Mr. Dingley recorded in his diary: "We have been through the bill twice and now have the knotty problems to solve."

The conference had now reached an acute stage, struggling with the wool and the sugar schedules. There was danger of a deadlock over the sugar schedule, and many members of the house declared they would vote against the conference report altogether, rather than adopt the senate sugar schedule. Mr. Dingley conferred with Speaker Reed and enlisted the aid of the latter in the fight against the senate sugar rates. Finally on the sixteenth of July, after an all day conference an agreement was reached. The senate surrendered and adopted practically the house rates.

The persistency of some of the senate conferees in demanding the adoption of the senate sugar rates, was a matter of no little comment. The presence of agents of the American Sugar Refining company added to the suspicion and made the house Republican conferees all the more determined to stand firm. It was Mr. Dingley's position in this matter that finally won the day. It was his accurate knowledge of the technicalities of the sugar trade and the

practice of the treasury department, that enabled him to cope with the subtle propositions of the agents of the so-called sugar trust. Mr. Dingley insisted that the differential of twelve and a half cents to a hundred pounds was enough protection for the refiners. Furthermore, he gave protection to the growers of beet and cane sugar in the United States by declining to reduce the duty on low grade sugar.

On the afternoon of July 17, a final agreement was reached on all disputed points, and the preparation of the report was begun that evening in the senate appropriations committee room. Mr. Allison and Mr. Dingley were the chief compilers of the report; and with the aid of efficient clerks, it was completed by midnight. Mr. Dingley retired that night worn out physically and mentally, but relieved over the final agreement. However, he slept peacefully and arose the next morning much refreshed and ready for the final act. The completed report was laid before the Democratic conferees at 10 o'clock in the morning, and after a sharp contest it was voted to report it to both houses.

The labor of getting the conference report printed, of securing printed copies of the revised bill showing the original provisions, the senate amendments and the action of the conference committee, was enormous; but before noon of the nineteenth a copy was on the desk of every member of the house. Every preparation had been made so that the house might proceed immediately.

July 19 was a memorable day in the history of the fifty-fifth congress. Long before noon the corridors and the galleries about the house were thronged with people. The floor of the house presented an animated appearance before the speaker called the members to order. The blind chaplain in his prayer invoked a blessing on the day's work. "May the history of this day," he prayed, "be worthy of this great nation and redound to the good of all its citizens."

After some preliminary business was disposed of, Mr. Dingley arose from his seat. Holding aloft the report and a great mass of papers, he said in a calm voice: "Mr. Speaker, I desire to present the conference report on the tariff bill." The announcement was received with great applause on the Republican side.

Mr. Dingley took the floor to secure, if possible, an agreement with the minority as to the length of debate. Mr. Bailey said the minority would like three days, whereupon Mr. Dingley replied that this agreement could not be made. "I hope," said the chairman, "that a vote can be reached today." At this the Republicans again

broke into loud and long applause. "Talk at this time," added Mr. Dingley, "is expensive. It costs the treasury one hundred thousand dollars a day."

"Not so expensive as the ten days you spent in arranging the sugar schedule with the sugar trust," retorted Mr. Bailey.

Mr. Dingley calmly pointed out that no tariff bill had been in conference such a short time.

"I suggest that we wait until sugar stock goes up a little higher," retorted Mr. Bailey. "It has gone up six dollars per share since the agreement was reported."

To these taunts Mr. Dingley did not reply. He preferred to save his energy for a more favorable time. Failing to reach an agreement with the minority as to the limit of debate, Mr. Dingley proceeded with his speech. ¹ He showed few signs of the extraordinary and severe physical strain which he had undergone. His face was a little whiter than usual, but his brain was as clear and his mind as alert as ever. His grasp of all the details of his subject was as firm as ever. It was fortunate, for he was a target for questions from every side. Reports from Wall street, set afloat to embarrass the Republicans and to prevent the adoption of the conference report, did not disturb Mr. Dingley's perfect calm and self control. He was master of his subject, and master of the house. He became a prophet when he declared that the customs revenue from the bill during the first year would be one hundred and eighty-five million dollars, and from internal revenue about one hundred and eighty million dollars; ² and "after this fiscal year, when this bill shall have become a law, the revenue will be increased to that point where every expenditure will be met, and there will be a surplus left with which can be resumed the reduction of the principal of the public debt." This statement was greeted with loud applause on the Republican side. His thorough mastery of the sugar schedule and the intricate questions involved, amazed the house; and caused a volley of questions as much for information as for criticism. He was surrounded by half a hundred members who listened attentively to the questions and answers. The scene had the appearance of a master instructing his pupils. In conclusion Mr. Dingley received round after round of applause from his Re-

1—See Appendix.

2—The receipts of the treasury for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1898, and June 30, 1899, were:

	Internal revenue	Customs.
1898	\$170,900,641.49	\$149,575,062.35
1899	\$73,487,161.51	\$06,123,481.75

The receipts from internal revenue in 1899 include receipts from the war revenue tax of April, 1898.

publican colleagues, by predicting as a result of the enactment of the bill the rise of prices and a restoration of prosperity. The debate continued until six o'clock when a recess was taken until eight.

The light from the great lantern on the dome of the capitol, streaming out over the city, gave notice that the house of representatives was holding an extraordinary session. Long before eight o'clock crowds began to gather at the capitol. In the galleries were many distinguished people—members of the cabinet, members of the supreme court and members of the diplomatic corps. Altogether it was a brilliant setting for the close of a memorable struggle.

The Republicans still pursued their policy of silence, compelling the minority to put forward their speakers. As a result the minority leaders soon became involved in a quarrel among themselves. The controversy between Mr. Bailey and Mr. McMillin consumed much of the time of the night session and bordered on the acrimonious. Mr. Dingley stoutly claimed that the sugar schedule agreed to, gave less protection to refined sugar than did the tariff of 1894. In reply to denunciations as to the so-called sugar trust, he said that the trusts could not be eradicated by epithets. "The way to break down the sugar trust," he said, "is to establish a beet sugar factory in every congressional district in the country and make competition. That is the way to clip the wings of the trust." This declaration was greeted with exclamations of favor on the republican side. Debate closed shortly before midnight; and amid a storm of cheering Mr. Dingley moved the previous question on the adoption of the conference report. Attempts were made to obtain the recognition of the speaker and delay action, but all failed. Excitement was at fever heat, but the demand for the previous question was sustained. The roll was then called on the adoption of the conference report; and when the speaker announced the result—189 ayes and 115 nays—the Republicans broke into loud cheers. As the clock pointed to half after midnight, a great crowd of Republican congressmen gathered on the floor of the house singing "America" to celebrate the final vote after four months of dreary delay; and to emphasize the fact that the delay was the fault of the senate, the members of the house marched over to the north wing of the capitol and there woke the echoes with the national anthem. Throughout this dramatic incident, Mr. Dingley, the hero of the hour, stood calm and unmoved, receiving

with characteristic modesty the congratulations that were showered upon him.

There was great rejoicing throughout the country over the tariff victory; and the scene of action was transferred to the senate. Here five days later, the conference report was adopted by a vote of 36 ayes to 20 noes. Senatorial dignity was overruled by applause in the galleries.

The crowds which filled the senate galleries when the vote was taken at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, now flocked to the house side, and every inch of space in the galleries was taken, when the house re-assembled at half past three. When it was announced that the senate had adopted the conference report on the tariff bill, the Republican side of the house broke into a storm of applause that swept over the floor and galleries. As Speaker Reed signed the bill the applause and cheers continued. Mr. Dingley then presented a resolution from the committee on ways and means for the final adjournment of congress at 9 o'clock at night, the senate leaders having previously agreed upon this hour. The resolution was agreed to. In the meantime a message had been sent from the executive mansion recommending the appointment of a currency commission. In obedience to this message, a bill providing for the appointment was introduced and briefly discussed. Mr. Dingley spoke in favor of the bill because the president had requested the action, because the business men urged it, and because the information would be valuable to congress. The bill was finally passed.

As soon as the speaker had affixed his signature to the tariff bill, Mr. Hager, chairman of the house committee on enrolled bills, in company with Mr. Dingley at once drove to the executive mansion where the president awaited their arrival. A few minutes before 4 o'clock in the afternoon, Mr. Dingley and party appeared. The president and members of the cabinet had assembled in the cabinet room to witness the signing of the bill. The president sat at the end of the long cabinet table with Secretary Gage and Attorney General McKenna on one side, and Postmaster General Gary and Secretary Wilson on the other side. The president greeted Mr. Dingley cordially. Secretary Porter turned to the last sheet of the bill and laid the document before the president. The latter had several pens at hand, the owners of which had begged that they might be used to sign the tariff bill; but Mr. Dingley, quickly taking a case from his pocket, produced a beautiful mother-of-pearl handled pen, dainty enough for a woman's use, and re-

quested that it be used for the signature. The president recognized the right of Mr. Dingley, although he laughingly commented on the diminutive size of the pen. Dipping this pen into the ink well, he appended his signature to the bill, asked the date and wrote: "July 24, 1897, approved," and the Dingley bill was a law. There was a burst of applause from the spectators. Everybody in the room except the president was standing; and as the president moved the pen, Attorney McKenna said: "It is just four minutes past four." The president congratulated Mr. Dingley on the successful ending of his arduous task, and the members of the cabinet did likewise. Mr. Dingley acknowledged the kind words with thanks, and after carefully putting away the pen, left the room. At 9 o'clock congress adjourned and the special session of the fifty-fifth congress was at an end.

Mr. Dingley's great work was done. The tariff bill which was destined to be his great monument, was completed. Day and night, month after month, with patience, skill and perseverance, he prepared and put through the great bill which made his country prosperous and his name famous forever. He was not borne out on the shoulders of a few demonstrative politicians as was Mr. Wilson in 1894, but a loyal and grateful people paid homage to his attainments and the breadth and virility of his statesmanship. Of the nation's illustrious sons, none ever more truly won his way by genuine merit than this industrious, courageous, unpretending man.¹

The country was not forgetful of its great debt to Mr. Dingley. A man of capacity, of thoroughness, of conscientiousness and large experience, he brought to the task which Speaker Reed assigned him as fine a character and as full an equipment as the country could have desired.² The nation applauded Mr. Reed's selection,

1—May 26, 1901, General Joseph Wheeler of Alabama wrote the author of this volume as follows: "I came across the enclosed paper. It was an effort to show our high regard for Mr. Dingley." The paper reads as follows: "We, the undersigned, members of the committee on ways and means, in order to express our high regard for Hon Nelson Dingley Jr., chairman of the committee, request that the Hon. Sereno E. Payne, Hon. John Dalsell and Hon. Benton McMillin, act as a committee to select and purchase a suitable testimonial to be presented by the committee to its honored chairman, each of the undersigned subscribing ten dollars to carry out its purpose. (Signed) Joseph Wheeler, S. W. Cobb, C. J. Boatner, John L. McLaurin, George W. Steele, John Dalsell, S. E. Payne, Walter Evans."

2—Henry McFarland, the Washington correspondent of the Boston Herald, wrote under date of January 13, 1899: "In the judgment of his colleagues Mr. Dingley was the best chairman of the committee on ways and means in its history, and besides that, was one of the most tactful, sagacious, resourceful and thorough parliamentary leaders ever known in the house. 'Thorough' was his motto. His peculiar abilities for dealing with all tariff and financial questions, and for everything coming under the head of business, were developed by the most intense application, which enriched him with accurate knowledge of the most varied and extensive character. His memory for facts, and especially for statistics, was marvelous. Apparently, he carried in his mind at least the indexes of all the voluminous publications of the ways and means committee, the senate finance committee and the house committees on banking and currency

and Mr. Dingley justified that selection. The tariff bill of 1897 bore on every page, the imprint of his knowledge and sound judgment.

The Dingley tariff law was received favorably by a large majority of the people. To the few critics he replied: "The fact is that this bill is drawn on national, not sectional lines, and that it applies the policy of protection without impartiality all along the line. It is a bill in the interests of all parts of our common country."

Throughout this period, Mr. Dingley was a prolific source from which newspaper and magazine caricaturists drew their inspiration. Democratic newspapers exaggerated his personal appearance often to a shocking degree. A New York paper published a grotesque colored picture of "Uncle Sam's Easter Parade." Mr. Dingley in the garb of a Turkish attendant was perched on a huge elephant, vigorously fanning President McKinley with a large ostrich feather labeled "Tariff bill." Another paper pictured him as conferring with the president who was pouring over the treasury books. Beneath the picture were these words: "Yes, Dingley, the protection is all right, but where's the revenue?" A Washington paper pictured him in a boy's sailor suit launching a toy boat labeled "Tariff bill." Another paper published a comical picture of Speaker Reed in the chair pounding the desk vigorously, while Mr. Bailey and Mr. Dingley were in the foreground engaged in the exercise of hair pulling. Beneath were these laconic words: "What we want is protection for our wool!" When the tariff bill was returned from the senate with several hundred amendments, a Democratic paper appeared the next day with a cartoon picturing Mr. Dingley as Falstaff, and beneath were the words of that historic character in King Henry IV.: "That thou art my son, I have partly thy mother's word, partly my own opinion; but chiefly, a villianous trick of thine eye, and a foolish hanging of thine nether lip, that doth warrant me."

An amusing incident which happened while the tariff bill was under discussion, was cartooned by a New York paper. The

and coinage, and knew just where to turn in the ten thousand pages of printed matter published monthly by congress, but by the executive department, on his special subjects for the particular things he needed. At the same time he was familiar with the decisions of the supreme court and of other important courts on these questions, and also with the chief governmental and other publications abroad bearing upon them. In hearings before his committee, in the debates on the floor of the house, and in the more intense debates of the conference committees of the two houses, Representative Dingley often astonished his associates with his technical learning. Many a congressional orator has been furnished the material for his speeches by Mr. Dingley, who was always generous with his knowledge. He had an almost unlimited capacity for work. He had almost as much to do with the McKinley tariff bill in its making as Mr. McKinley himself, and the latter realized that Gov. Dingley was just the man to make an ideal secretary of the treasury."

speaker found the house in confusion and thought it best to force an adjournment. While several members were shouting for recognition, the speaker said calmly: "The gentleman from Maine has the floor." But Mr. Dingley kept on writing at his desk. "The gentleman from Maine has the floor," shouted the speaker. Still Mr. Dingley wrote. "The gentleman from Maine moves that the house adjourn." And the house was adjourned before Mr. Dingley, absorbed in work, had uttered a word.

Republican papers cartooned him kindly but often ridiculously. In one picture he was pulling the tariff oar in a boat that was crossing the Delaware of dull times. In another he was pictured as the good Samaritan reviving the helpless and weary form of "Industry." In still another his bust was placed on a pedestal and above were the words: "A public benefactor."

July 25 he left Washington, the scene of his recent triumph, and sought rest at his island home on the shore of Maine. Here he quietly received the homage of not only admiring constituents but a whole nation. Congratulations followed him to his quiet summer home, where he watched with deep interest the initial operations of his great law. He was gratified at the commendation of American manufacturers and producers, and amused at the criticism of foreigners and importers. He was firmly convinced that the tariff law bearing his name, and being a definite and deliberate embodiment in law of a policy receiving national support, would in time vindicate its authors and justify their action. He was sure it would mark the beginning of a new and prosperous era in the history of the country. He waited patiently and confidently for the verdict of time.

Mr. Dingley's gratification over his public triumph was saddened by the death of his venerable father, August 3, at the age of 87 years. His distinguished son was the idol of Nelson Dingley, Sr., and up to the very last the father watched with keen interest and parental pride, his son's successful career. Mr. Dingley reached the bedside of his father at his brother Frank's in Auburn, Maine, before the end came early in the morning. He recorded in his diary: "At 9:20 a. m. dear father passed away as peacefully as possible. As the last heart beats came, tears came to all our eyes, for dear father had gone to another existence, no more to be with us on earth. His memory remains to us as a precious legacy. He was spared long to us and came to feel as if he desired to go hence and join dear mother in heaven. We doubt not he is with her now. Blessed reunion!"

At the funeral two days later, the old family horse, which the venerable man loved, led the way to the last resting place. Here, beside his beloved wife, who had passed beyond twenty-six years before and whom he longed to join, he was laid away by two loving sons in his last resting place. The loss of his father was a heavy blow to Mr. Dingley.

The months of September and October were for the most part months of rest for this busy man. In the quiet of his home, surrounded by his devoted family, he found joy and comfort, for no man loved home more than he. His domestic peace was broken one day in September by the appearance of an energetic woman at the door, announcing herself a representative of a New York paper, who had come to Lewiston to interview him about the clause in the tariff bill permitting persons coming from abroad to bring back free of duty only one hundred dollars worth of goods made abroad. This enterprising woman, "in behalf of outraged women, determined to go to Maine and talk this matter over with the fountain head of this tariff iniquity." Mr. Dingley received the lady hospitably and sympathetically.

"Mr. Dingley," said the young lady, "I have come to Maine to plead for the freedom of the American woman. Once she loved her country and its laws, now she no longer respects the laws—indeed she is forced to break them or lose her own self respect."

"What's that, what's that?" exclaimed Mr. Dingley in surprise. "What has the American woman to complain of? What does she want that she hasn't got?"

"She wants more than one hundred dollars worth of Paris ribbons and laces and hats and she wants them free," exclaimed the woman.

"If the American women complain of that clause," said Mr. Dingley quietly, "we will have to take it out, and not allow the women to bring back anything more than they took over. After all, why should women who are able to go abroad, have the privilege of buying one hundred dollars worth of goods and landing them free of duty, while those who remain at home, if they want the same things, pay the duty to the shop keeper, in the shape of high prices? Now, I am going to tell you a secret," said Mr. Dingley as he wrinkled his nose and put on a half serious air. "Ever since the tariff bill went into effect I have had frequent recurring twinges of conscience in regard to that one hundred dollar clause. I am convinced that it is unjust to those who stay at home, and should be taken out of the bill."

Mr. Dingley watched keenly the effect of this remark.

"Really, Mr. Dingley," said the woman in amazement, "do you intend to do this?"

"I can't tell what I shall do," replied Mr. Dingley mysteriously; "but you need not be surprised if I should come to that. Why, I am almost ashamed of the American women if what you say of them is true. They don't appreciate their blessings."

The reporter declared that the women would become smugglers and defy the law.

"I have a higher opinion of your sex," said Mr. Dingley gallantly, "than you seem to have. They will not be dishonest and smuggle."

Mr. Dingley pointed out that the tariff gave the women of the country higher wages and better opportunities, and that the "one hundred dollar" clause had the effect only of keeping our rich people from buying goods abroad instead of in America.

The entire interview was crisp and sparkling. It was a contest between a woman's wit and charm and a statesman's courtesy and gallantry. Mr. Dingley was victorious, and the young newspaper woman departed, with a new idea of the tariff law and its chief author, Mr. Dingley.

In September a Boston newspaper ¹ published a signed article from Mr. Dingley in which he gave his opinion of the part the new tariff bill was playing in the revival of business. Among other things he said: "There seems to be a concession on all sides that a genuine revival of business has set in during the past two months, which promises a gradual but solid improvement until the country reaches the great prosperity of the period from 1879 to 1893. It is evident that a policy which involves either the transfer to foreign countries of the production or manufacture of many articles heretofore made here, with the consequent idleness of the labor employed on the same, or the reduction of our wages of labor to the European standard must result as it did, in the diminution of the purchasing power of the masses, with the inevitable falling off of the consumption of products by our people, and the resultant depression which we have experienced. And it is inevitable that the change from such a policy to the policy of encouraging home production and manufacture, determined upon at the recent session of congress, must tend to dispel distrust and establish confidence in the future, start idle industries, open up new opportunities for labor, increase the purchasing power of the masses, enlarge the

1—Sunday Globe, September 19, 1897.

demand for products, raise or at least tend to raise, prices, to a paying point, and to promote the prosperity of all classes. * * *

There is no good reason to believe that we shall have another tariff agitation to disturb the business of the country for many years.

In the first place the protective tariff bill just passed has been enacted so early in President McKinley's administration that any attempt to repeal it would be useless for years to come. In the second place, the industrial and business interests of the country, after the experience of tariff agitation which they have had the past four years, will demand tariff repose. In the third place, before any effective steps could be taken to revolutionize the tariff, our industries and business will be so thoroughly adjusted to the new tariff, and will have before them so complete a demonstration of its beneficence in comparison with the results of the tariff of 1894, that any attempts to carry an election against protection will be futile. Whatever isolated amendments may be necessary to correct possible errors in a measure of so many details, or to adjust items to changed conditions, will be in accord with the objects of the law, as stated in the title—"To provide revenue for the government and to encourage the industries of the United States." * * * *

There is a disposition in some quarters to criticise the Republican majority of the house of representatives for resolutely confining its work at the recent extra session, to the revision of the tariff. The reason for this course is obvious and the result has justified the policy pursued. The Republican party had pledged itself to a prompt revision of the tariff on protective lines. It was felt that in order to secure such a revision, it was necessary to hold the attention of congress and the country for the time being to the one question of tariff revision, and to avoid any opportunity for the raising of other diverting issues. This course was absolutely necessary in order to clear the path for even currency legislation."

The November elections of 1897 were conducted by the Democratic leaders, not on the issues raised the year before by the Chicago platform, but on such local and temporary issues as could be seized upon in the different states. Mr. Dingley said: "It is evident that Mr. Bryan still retains his hold on the Democratic party and will be its candidate for the presidency in 1900. It is doubtful, however, if he keeps the silver issue so prominently to the front.

* * * While it is evident that the Democratic party is to remain for the next few years under the leadership of Mr. Bryan, and to make its contests on the lines of the Chicago platform, except that silver is to be made less prominent, yet it is not probable that

under his guidance it again will come any nearer to carrying the country than in 1896. The Democrats who, even under the pressure of regularity, refused to support Bryan, will still refuse to do so, and although their numbers may not be formidable, yet their character and influence will most effectively tell against the Democratic party so long as it is committed to so mischievous principles as those maintained by the Chicago convention."

Mechanic's hall, Boston, was the scene of a brilliant gathering on the evening of November 11. It was the occasion of a notable dinner given by the Home Market club. Nearly 1,000 persons were seated at the tables, while fifteen hundred spectators were in the galleries and on the stage. The hall was tastefully decorated, portraits of Republicans in history adorning the walls. A large bulletin was suspended over the stage, on which were printed the Republican and Democratic majorities in the states in which the elections had taken place that year (1897). The speakers of the evening were Mr. Dingley, Mr. Russell, a member of congress from Connecticut, and Senator Lodge of Massachusetts. Mr. Dingley was received with cheers and an abundance of applause as he was presented by the chairman of the evening. His address¹ was scholarly and forcible. He defended the tariff law which bore his name and predicted that it would be a success. Mr. Dingley was the hero of the hour, and was referred to as a man "whose mastery of the tariff is admitted everywhere throughout the country."

November 27 Mr. Dingley conferred with Speaker Reed at his home in Portland on important legislation to come before congress, and on the second of December left for Washington to resume his public duties. Shortly before leaving home he was asked if Cuban affairs were likely to lead to action by congress. He replied: "I have no doubt that there will be a strong effort to induce congress to take the solution of the Cuban question from the hands of the president and secretary of state to whom the conduct of diplomatic matters properly belongs, and have congress, which from the nature of the case is ill-fitted to direct our delicate relations with other nations, undertake to solve them by resolutions and campaign speeches. Speaking for myself, I think that sound policy and the best interests of Cuba require that the management of this matter be left with the president who has already done much for the Cuban cause. At the same time the pressure for some kind of action by congress may lead congress to pass a belligerency resolution. The people of the United States are in sympathy with the

1—See Appendix.

Cuban insurgents and ready to extend whatever aid can be properly given their cause without inviting war. We are not ready to get into war to help any cause either in Cuba or in America."

He arrived in Washington December 4 and again resumed Washington life in his apartments at the Hamilton house.

CHAPTER XXIII.

1898.

President McKinley in his message paid tribute to the Dingley tariff law by saying that "while its full effect has not been realized, what it has already accomplished assures us of its timeliness and wisdom. To test its permanent value further time will be required, and the people, satisfied with its operations and results thus far, are in no mind to withhold from it a fair trial."

During the first days of this session attempts were made to produce the impression that the Republican members of the ways and means committee had become disheartened on account of the comparatively small receipts of revenue from customs during the first four months under the new tariff law. Already the impression had gained ground that supplementary legislation would be needed to secure to the government needed revenue. While the pension appropriation bill was under discussion, Mr. Dingley took occasion to make an interesting and timely statement,¹ removing at once all apprehension. He considered and discussed the probable receipts of revenue from customs in considerable detail, and fully and fairly answered the criticisms made at the beginning of the session. The loss of revenue through anticipatory importations were, he said, not the fault of the new law, but due to the long delay in its final passage, and also to the failure of the retrospective provision which had been incorporated in the bill when it passed the house. He expressed the opinion that in the last four months of the current fiscal year, the federal treasury would support itself. Towards the close

1—See Appendix.

of his speech he was plied with questions by the leaders of the Democratic side, which were fully and pertinently answered. That the statements and explanations were satisfactory to the majority, was clearly shown by the frequent applause on the Republican side.

Mr. Dingley's facts and figures, carrying all the weight of expert knowledge and the endorsement of the executive branch of the government, cleared the atmosphere and renewed public confidence. The indications were that the revival of trade and industry, then so marked, was but the healthy beginning of a larger growth; and that the Dingley tariff law as a source of revenue, was destined to be a success.

The statement of the treasury department on the last day of December, was exceedingly encouraging and gratifying, indicating that the period of monthly deficits was at an end. Mr. Dingley's estimates and predictions thus far had been so accurate, that his opinion that the receipts of the last half of the current fiscal year would exceed the expenditures, was received with great confidence. While he felt a reasonable degree of confidence that under existing laws the revenue of the succeeding fiscal year would equal expenditures, if the latter were kept within reasonable bounds, he was not unmindful of the possibility that an emergency might arise which would require a speedy addition to the income of the government. He said: "We know where we can get from twenty-five to thirty million dollars of revenue at any time the necessity arises, and there is no reason to doubt that the needful legislation could be promptly enacted if an emergency should demand it. However, there is nothing to indicate that such legislation will be necessary. On the contrary, everything promises a period of rest."

Mr. Dingley regarded as one of the most gratifying features of the government's financial condition, the fact that during the six months ending December 31, thirty-eight million dollars in gold had come into the treasury and only eighteen million gone out. "This is as good proof of the restoration of confidence as I desire," he said. "We have money in the treasury—greenbacks, treasury notes, gold, silver and silver certificates and national bank notes, and all of them are good to pay any of our debts. People do not stop to see what sort of currency they receive; it is all good. The endless chain is broken and it cannot be welded together again so long as the revenues of the government are sufficient to meet its current expenditures."

The reduction of wages by employers and the strike among the operatives in the cotton mills of New England, afforded the enemies of protection and the Dingley tariff law, an opportunity to call attention to what they characterized the failure of the Republican policy of protection. During the discussion of the diplomatic appropriation bill, Mr. Dingley took occasion to speak¹ upon this question. He called attention to the decline in the price of cotton and cotton cloth, and the absence of labor laws in the south, restricting the hours of labor and giving the south an immense advantage. He said that wages in the New England mills must come down to the level of wages in the south until the south should bring its standard of labor up to the level of labor in the north.²

The adoption of the Teller resolution by the senate, declaring that the government bonds are payable in gold or silver and "that to restore to its position such silver coins as are legal tender in the payment of said bonds is not in violation of the public faith nor in derogation of the rights of the public creditor," was a distinct blow to the credit of the United States and a check to the rapid restoration of confidence already near at hand. The proposition plunged the senate into another tedious and mischievous debate on the silver question, when financial peace and industrial prosperity were so much needed. The resolution was sent to the house and was referred to the committee on ways and means. On the morning of the last day of January the committee met and ordered an adverse report on the resolution.

There was great activity among the leaders on both sides for an hour before the house met January 31, in anticipation of an exciting debate on the resolution. There was a full attendance on the floor and in the galleries. The struggle began as soon as the journal was read, when Mr. Dingley reported back the resolution with the recommendation that it do not pass. A special order, providing for the immediate consideration of the resolution was adopted, precipitating a bitter partisan debate, and throwing the house into

1—See Appendix.

2—Mr. Dingley received the following letter: New York, January 22, 1890. My Dear Sir: I hasten to congratulate you on your recent speech in the house on the New England industrial situation. Reduction of the hours of labor, or in other words, the extension of the New England laws through the south is the true way of approaching that question. It is in reality the only means of applying the principles of protection to the cotton industry of New England, by demanding higher competitive conditions. If it is contrary to public policy and as inimical to national welfare to permit industries to be transferred from New England to the south by means of long hours and low wage barbarism as it is to have American industries transferred to Europe by the same means. From meager reports in the daily press you have struck the right key. Very cordially yours, George Gunton.

confusion. Mr. Dingley opened the debate with a carefully prepared speech¹ sounding the keynote of the opposition. He declared that the last clause of the resolution was in reality a disguised declaration for the free coinage of silver. He said: "No one denies that this or any other nation has the power to pay in full or in part or none of its obligations, in gold, or silver, or paper, or copper according to its pleasure. Payment cannot be enforced against a sovereign nation. Its obligations are measured by its own sense of honor and good faith. But even if this sense of honor is at any time blinded, as was Shylock's, by dwelling on a narrow view of the letter rather than the spirit of the obligation, the intelligent self interest of a nation which is to live not simply for a generation but for centuries, ought to lead it—and wherever a nation is wisely governed does lead it—to so scrupulously maintain its pledges in both letter and spirit as to preserve its credit untarnished, and thereby not only make it possible to borrow at the lowest rate of interest, but also to make it easy to obtain loans in exigencies, which are sure, sooner or later, to come to every nation. A nation's honor and credit are among its most priceless possessions—aye, its title deed to permanence and prosperity."¹

He appealed to the members of the house "to keep all our currency, whether silver or paper, as good as gold, and preserve inviolable the public faith and credit." Contrary to his usual custom, Mr. Dingley read this speech; and the intense interest in his utterances caused the Democratic side of the chamber to be deserted by members who crowded the aisles around the speaker in their effort to catch every word that fell from his lips. The debate which followed was heated and at times sensational; and after five hours of discussion, the resolution was defeated by a vote of 182 to 132. This decisive action and the declarations of Mr. Dingley on the floor immediately strengthened the credit of the nation and restored public confidence in the financial centers. Mr. Dingley was warmly congratulated.

February third, with Secretary Gage, Postmaster General Gary and others, he attended a banquet at Baltimore given by the Merchants' and Manufacturers' association. He spoke briefly on "Our Industrial and Business Future," predicting that the United States would soon reach that measure of prosperity which was hers

1—See Appendix.

2—The New York Sun said of this speech: "It touches, perhaps, the highest level of statesmanship ever reached by this conscientious, painstaking, industrious legislator, whose long and distinguished services to his party and his country, have brought him to the leadership of the majority in the house."

from 1879 to 1893. Confidence, he said, was rapidly taking the place of distrust and uncertainty.

Mr. Dingley always dressed plainly and modestly. His clothes were invariably of domestic manufacture. One day early in February, Mr. Simpson of Kansas, who was personally very fond of Mr. Dingley, discovered in the latter's silk hat, what appeared to be a London maker's name. In a spirit of pure fun, the member from Kansas made known this discovery in the course of debate, drawing exaggerated and fanciful conclusions from what he was pleased to call the shortcomings of the great apostle of protection and defender of home industries. Mr. Dingley was momentarily embarrassed, but took the joke good naturedly, explaining it by saying that he had never seen the London mark in his hat, and that the hat was probably made in New York and a London mark put in it, to please those who always preferred the English. Mr. Dingley, goaded by the member from Kansas, retorted to the latter's insinuations, that Mr. Simpson was given to "talking through his hat." The episode caused much amusement in the house but Mr. Dingley proved equal to the occasion.

February twenty-fifth, while the house had under consideration the sundry civil appropriation bill, Mr. Moody of Massachusetts made an unwarranted attack upon Mr. Dingley. The Massachusetts member in the course of a sharp speech created a sensation by calling attention to the appropriation of \$300,000 carried in the bill for Rockland, (Maine) harbor. With great sarcasm he referred to this "vast appropriation for an insignificant harbor on the Maine coast." The village and harbor, he said, could be buried in the harbor of Boston.

A member inquired, "whose district is Rockland in?" Mr. Moody replied, waving his hand: "I do not care to state, but we all know." This caused the Democrats to laugh, and Mr. Moody proceeded. "I am ready to submit to a regime of rigid economy," declared Mr. Moody with great vehemence, "if such is necessary; and to submit to honest leadership, but I for one propose to be against such discrimination."

The charge that Mr. Dingley urged economy in public and sought large appropriations for his own district in private, caused no little consternation among the members. They waited breathlessly for the Republican leader to speak. Rising in his place, perhaps slightly paler than usual, his eyes giving evidence of mingled temperance and indignation, he addressed the house. He explained with considerable vigor that the work at Rockland was the

construction of a harbor of refuge, precisely such a harbor of refuge as was contemplated for Sandy Bay in Mr. Moody's district. "Personally, I care nothing about it," said Mr. Dingley. "The work was placed under the contract system not by me but by the river and harbor committee at the suggestion of the board of engineers." Then, looking Mr. Moody squarely in the face and speaking slightly louder and more deliberately than usual, he said: "I repudiate the intimation that personally I interested myself in it or asked for it. I appeal to the members of the committee on appropriations to bear me out when I say that I have not made to any of them an intimation or suggestion on the subject."

Mr. Stone and Mr. Cannon, members of the committee on appropriations both stated that Mr. Dingley had never said a word to them concerning the appropriation. Mr. Stone said with much vigor: "A member might as well allege that the chaplain of the house has lobbied for legislation as to intimate that the gentleman from Maine was going about interesting and besieging committees for projects for his own district." This declaration was greeted with loud applause, and Mr. Moody subsided. Rarely had the house witnessed a personal attack more skillfully and successfully refuted. And what was more, Mr. Dingley exhibited a temperate spirit, refusing to indulge in personalities.

When congress reassembled on the sixth day of December, 1897, the members from the various states, south as well as north, brought reports of a strong public sentiment against the course pursued by Spain in the island of Cuba. The special session had been devoted exclusively to economic questions and the Cuban question was kept in the background. But the pressure of public opinion now increased and action was demanded. The president was flooded with petitions and waited upon by delegates urging immediate action. With his usual frankness he explained his plans and his aspirations for a peaceful settlement. The extra session adjourned without action, because it trusted the president and his advisers. To withstand the now increasing pressure, to continue to enforce the laws of neutrality in the face of a hostile public sentiment, imposed upon the president duties which called for the exercise of the highest executive ability. His message, was, therefore, awaited with intense interest; and when in that notable document, he temperately discussed the situation, counseled peaceful negotiations, put aside the recognition of the belligerency of or the independence of the Cuban republic, and declared that Spain had promised a new order of things in Cuba, public sentiment was

not quite satisfied. At the same time he added these significant words: "If it shall hereafter appear to be a duty imposed by our obligations to ourselves, to civilization and humanity, to intervene with force, it shall be without fault on our part and only because the necessity of such action shall be as clear as to command the support and approval of the civilized world."

On the night of February 15, eleven weeks after the assembling of congress, the United States battleship *Maine*, while on a friendly visit to the harbor of Havana, and lying at a mooring especially assigned to her by the captain of the port, was destroyed by a submarine mine, and in this catastrophe two of her officers and 264 of her crew perished.

When Mr. Dingley read the news of the destruction of the *Maine*, he foresaw serious trouble. When he reached the house about 10 o'clock in the morning, he was besieged with members who demanded an immediate declaration of war. He was summoned to the White House by the president, where the critical condition was privately discussed. President McKinley and Mr. Dingley were of the same mind—war must be averted if possible. The country was not ready for war; and on the Republican leader in the house the president relied, to avert if possible the awful alternative of a conflict of arms.

Up to the time of the destruction of the *Maine*, Mr. Dingley believed that war with Spain would be averted through peaceable pressure brought to bear on the Spanish ministry, and consequently no preparations for an armed conflict were entered upon. While the hope of a peaceful solution continued to be entertained by Mr. Dingley, pending the inquiry into the blowing up of the *Maine*, nevertheless he informed the president that appropriations would be forthcoming when required. A caucus of the house of representatives, confined to no one political party but representing only the war party, declared almost unanimously for an immediate declaration of war.

Excitement so increased in consequence of rumors that the naval inquiry board would probably report that the *Maine* was destroyed by external agencies, that on the seventh of March the president summoned to the White House the chairmen of the finance committee and committee on appropriations of the senate, and the chairmen of the committee on ways and means and committee on appropriations of the house, with several other leading members of both houses, to confer with him and his cabinet on the critical condition of affairs. Mr. Dingley realized that

public sentiment demanded immediate action. He opposed a declaration of war, hoping that the excitement would subside and the difficulty be solved without actual hostility. It was finally suggested by the president that congress appropriate immediately fifty million dollars "for national defense," to be expended by the president. The object of this appropriation was to put the country measurably in a position to enter into an armed conflict, in case one could not be avoided.

Great crowds were in the galleries of the house long before the session began March 8. The bill appropriating fifty million dollars for national defense passed the house by a unanimous vote amid intense excitement. The speeches, mostly by Democratic members, were all patriotic. Speaker Reed, who seldom voted except in case of a tie, asked to have his name called, and he voted "aye." The bill passed the senate the following day without debate and without a dissenting vote.

With great difficulty the armed conflict was averted for six weeks, and during this time every effort was put forth to prepare the country for war, so far as coast defences and military and naval supplies were concerned. During these weeks Mr. Dingley received many letters urging him to stand by the president in his efforts to avert war if possible. So great was the alarm in Mr. Dingley's own district that many citizens of Bath asked the government that a monitor be sent to the Kennebec river for the protection of property. A constituent in Newcastle, Maine, wrote: "I do hope that in the interest of humanity you will use all your power with the president to avert this threatening calamity." A leading banking house in Boston wrote: "Our relations with business men all over New England are close, and we find a practical unanimity in favor of a cordial support of the policy of President McKinley. We feel that your influence with other members of congress is of great importance in bringing them to a recognition of this sentiment." A Philadelphian wrote him: "We believe if you hold and ponder you will save us the horrors of war. It will be the triumph of the nineteenth century." From a prominent member of the Grand Army of the Republic Mr. Dingley learned that "there is no popular feeling in favor of war with Spain upon our own account because there is no belief in the existence of even the most remote cause for such a war."

On the twelfth of March Mr. Dingley called on President McKinley at the White House and talked over the situation with the executive. Congress had the constitutional right to declare war,

but the president wanted no war, nor did Mr. Dingley; and at this conference the question how to avert war was discussed. These two leaders agreed first that the question should be solved by diplomacy if possible; second, that the Cuban insurgent government should not be recognized by this government. When, on the 23rd of March, the naval board of inquiry made its report, the days of diplomacy were over. Mr. Dingley then admitted that war with Spain was apparently inevitable. The whole country was aroused. Public sentiment was unmistakable for war. President McKinley faced the critical situation with calmness and composure. To him the most immediate danger was an ill-considered declaration of war by congress; but with Mr. Dingley and other cool heads at the helm in the house he felt sure nothing would be done to make the situation more trying.

It required the firm and united efforts of Speaker Reed, Mr. Dingley, Mr. Hitt and other old and wise heads in the house, to keep in check the "insurgent" members as they were called. Secret caucuses were held by this coterie of members, and committees were appointed to wait on the speaker and his lieutenants to demand immediate action.

The president's message, accompanying the report of the court of inquiry, did not satisfy the war element in congress, the Democrats particularly showing their impatience March 30 by springing a resolution in the house recognizing the independence of Cuba. Under the leadership of Mr. Dingley the Republicans held together and sustained the speaker in ruling that the resolution was not privileged.

The impatience of the people was evidenced daily by the crowds in the house galleries, and their frequent outbursts of applause. Several times the speaker threatened to clear the galleries. The strain upon Mr. Dingley, the recognized leader of the conservatives, and the representative of the administration in the house, was severe. It was owing to his firmness and his great influence over the Republicans that the house consented to wait patiently for the final result of the president's diplomacy.

Washington was the scene of unparalleled excitement during the month of April. War was talked of in and out of congress. The president was openly censured for delay; Mr. Dingley was likewise censured by many in the house, for standing with the president in his policy of delay. The crisis was expected April 6 and great crowds flocked to the capitol to hear the president's

gress, including Mr. Dingley, were hastily summoned to the White House where the safety of General Lee and other American citizens in Cuba was discussed, and a delay agreed upon. The country was momentarily angry, but quickly subsided.

In the mean time the president informed Mr. Dingley that war was inevitable, and that funds to conduct the conflict would be needed. With a heavy heart but with a patriotic sense of duty, on the evening of April 8, Mr. Dingley began the preparation of a war revenue bill. For several weeks he had been in consultation with the other Republican members of the ways and means committee and with the treasury department forecasting a reasonable course of action for the emergency at hand.

Undaunted by the disappointment of the week previous, a multitude again besieged the capitol on the morning of April 11, even before the doors were open. Many camped out on the marble terraces all night and others arrived at early dawn. The day was dark and gloomy, but the thousands were undismayed.

The scene in the house was memorable, as the eye swept the banked galleries and animated groups of members on the floor below. As the hands of the clock pointed to noon the speaker entered, the hubbub waned, and an impressive silence followed as the chaplain invoked divine assistance in the crisis. Then the president's message was read and a murmur of approval swept over the house as the words of the chief executive were read: "I ask the congress to authorize and empower the president to take measures to secure a full and final termination of hostilities between the government of Spain and the people of Cuba, and to secure in the island the establishment of a stable government capable of maintaining order, and observing its international obligations, insuring peace and tranquility and the security of its citizens as well as our own, and to use the military and naval forces of the United States as may be necessary for these purposes. The issue is now with congress. It is a solemn responsibility. I have exhausted every effort to relieve the intolerable condition of affairs which is at our door. Prepared to execute every obligation imposed upon me by the constitution and the law, I await your action."

The die was cast. War was inevitable. Two sets of resolutions were introduced in both houses representing the views of the conservative and radical factions. Leadership of the Republican majority in the house during these trying times required a cool head and an alert mind. The radicals in the house, including many Republicans, openly denounced Speaker Reed and Mr. Dingley,

particularly the latter. On several occasions Mr. Dingley held secret conferences with the leading radicals in the room of the committee on ways and means, and it was his strong influence that held them in check. Excitement in and about the house was at white heat; but a firm hand guided by a strong head was at the helm.

On the fourteenth of April the house unanimously agreed to a resolution for armed intervention in Cuba, an amendment recognizing the Cuban government being defeated. The conservative faction in the house led by Mr. Dingley and Speaker Reed triumphed. Mr. Hitt, chairman of the committee on foreign affairs, was absent on account of illness, and Speaker Reed took the matter in hand. He summoned the Republican leaders, including Mr. Dingley, to his private room and there mapped out the plan of operation. Mr. Adams, second on the foreign affairs committee was expected to handle the resolution on the floor. It was bluntly suggested by one member that the resolution be offered by some other member. Mr. Adams flushed and replied hotly: "I yield only to my acknowledged superior, Gov. Dingley." The senate late on the evening of the sixteenth, after a fierce struggle, amended the resolution so as to recognize the Cuban government. Upon the question of recognition, the two houses disagreed and the struggle began.

Mr. Dingley displayed to great advantage his splendid generalship and rare leadership, throughout the memorable contest over the Cuban resolution, April 18. The recognition by the senate of the government of Cuba, strengthened the cause of the radicals in the house, and there were mutterings and threats of rebellious spirits who declared they would no longer follow the leadership of the conservative member from Maine. It was a critical moment. Mr. Dingley felt the heavy responsibility and realized the serious complications that would follow the official recognition of the government of Cuba. He said: "Mr. Speaker, it has been my hope, and I may add my expectation until a recent period, that the earnest desires and reasonable demands of the American people for an amelioration of the fearful condition of affairs in the island of Cuba, might be secured by the friendly offices or mediation of our government and the progress of events. While recent occurrences have now seemed to make hopeless a peaceable solution of the Cuban problem, yet it will be a satisfaction to the people of this country when the history of these days shall be written, that our government under the wise leadership of President McKinley has exhausted every effort to secure a peaceable solution—even in

the face of the impatient criticism of many of our citizens who have not fully weighed the importance not only of making that clear to the civilized world, but also of gaining needed time for preparation for the inevitable. While it is untimely now to discuss the question as to whether any step short of armed intervention, whether the recognition of the belligerent rights or the independence of the Cuban insurgents, if either had been taken alone earlier, would have permanently solved the Cuban problem, yet I think the progress of events has made it clear that either step would not have materially changed the current of events, and would have left the Cuban sore practically the same as it now exists. The facts and arguments presented by the president make it conclusive that any committal of the United States at this time to a recognition of the insurgents in Cuba, and the so-called military government which it is claimed they have established as the government which represents the people of Cuba and which this country must blindly follow, would not fulfill the requirements of international law, and would be unwise in the extreme and at the same time would utterly fail to bring to an end the sad condition in Cuba of which we complain.

"It must be remembered that recognition first and armed interference afterwards are impossible unless the interference is at the request of the government which has been recognized. The resolution which has been suggested looking to the recognition of the insurgents as the government of Cuba and then authorizing and directing the president to forcibly intervene in Cuban affairs, would be such a violation of international law as was never before known. The United States may recognize the insurgents as the de facto government of Cuba, if the evidence shows (as it does not yet show) that they have established a civil government with officials discharging governmental duties, with courts in operation, with a capitol and other evidences indicating the operation of the machinery of a government, acknowledged by a majority of the people; but if it does so it must stop there.

"The objects which the people of the United States have had in view in tendering our good offices to bring to a termination the serious conditions which have so long existed in Cuba, and which they still have in view in any more potent step, have been to put an end to the horrible cruelties which have been and are still perpetrated within a hundred miles of our shores, to protect the interests of American citizens in Cuba and secure our treaty rights; and to secure these ends in the only practical way that will give

permanence, that is by ending the Spanish misrule which has so long continued on the island, and securing to the people of Cuba the right of self government and independence. In other words the ultimate object we have had and still have in view is independence for all the people of Cuba, the recognition of the right of the people of Cuba to determine for themselves what government they will have—whether that government shall be the Gomez government or some other government that the people may establish, and not the imposition of a particular government on the people of Cuba by premature recognition by the United States.”¹

However, when the house met at 10 o'clock on the morning of April 18, he faced the crisis with a calm and resolution that astonished his associates. At the suggestion of Mr. Dingley, a recess was at once taken until 12 o'clock; and as it turned out, this recess saved the day for the conservatives. When the house re-assembled, practically all the Republicans had been brought into line. A little defiance remained, but it soon vanished. The short recess had given Mr. Dingley an opportunity to make his position a little more firm; and when the senate resolutions appeared in the house, Chairman Dingley in calm superiority, welcomed them. On Mr. Dingley's motion to concur in the senate amendments except the declaration that the people of Cuba are independent, the roll call began, and was followed with deep interest. Only four Republicans voted “no.” This was the last remnant of the band that gathered in excited caucus a week or more previous. Mr. Dingley's motion was carried by a vote of 179 to 156. Thus Mr. Reed and Mr. Dingley showed their mastery of the house. The senate refused to concur in the amendments of the house, and again the resolutions were in the latter body. Mr. Dingley again moved to non-concur, but Mr. Bromwell, the leader of the radicals or “insurgents” interposed a motion to concur, and this took precedence. The house was thrown into a fever of excitement as the roll call proceeded; but again Mr. Dingley triumphed, and Mr. Bromwell's motion was defeated. Then Mr. Dingley moved that the house insist upon its amendments and ask for a conference. The members of this memorable conference were Messrs. Davis.

1—April 20, 1896, Mr. Dingley received the following letter from Rev. Lyman Abbott of Brooklyn, New York: “In all the circles with which I am familiar, opposition to the recognition of the Cuban republic is almost unanimous. While I cannot but wish that the original house resolution could have been passed by both parties, will you allow me to exercise the privilege of an old friend in expressing to you my congratulations on your wisdom in securing a concession of the most important point at issue by your concessions of some other points which seem to me to have been, not without significance, but of secondary importance.”

Foraker and Morgan on the part of the senate, and Messrs. Adams, Heathwole and Dinsmore on the part of the house. For hours they struggled, the house finally taking a recess until 8 o'clock.

The hitch in the conference was over the two words "are and" in the senate resolution and the clause in the senate resolution that "the government of the United States hereby recognizes the republic of Cuba as the true and lawful government of that island." The senate wanted the resolution to read: "The people of the island of Cuba are and of a right ought to be free and independent and the government of the United States hereby recognizes the republic of Cuba as the true and lawful government of the island." The senate conferees insisted that this clause should stand; the house conferees insisted upon eliminating the words "are and" and the entire clause recognizing independence. The disagreement was reported to the house and again a conference was ordered and the house took a recess from 11 to 11:30 p. m. At 11:30 still another recess was taken until midnight. In the meantime a conference of some thirty leading Republicans had been held in the speaker's room. Here the speaker and Mr. Dingley urged the conservative Republicans to stand by their colors. Payne and Cannon, and Dalzell and Grosvenor and all the old war horses, declared they would, in the picturesque language of Cannon, "stand pat till hell freezes over." At midnight the house recessed until 12:30 to await the action of the conferees. During this recess many members congregated in the lobby in the rear of the hall, and led by several of the younger members sang many popular songs of the day. In the early morning hours came the final scene which was to precede the great drama. The capitol was brilliantly lighted and the galleries filled with an enthusiastic crowd of patriots. The house conferees sent for Speaker Reed and Mr. Dingley; and the two agreed to a compromise in order to avoid a complete deadlock. If the senate would give up the clause recognizing the independence of Cuba, the house would insert the two words "are and." The senate conferees quickly agreed to this and the compromise was reported to the two houses and agreed to by the house. The galleries echoed with patriotic cheers as the resolutions were read, and the curtain went down upon the first act of the great drama. At 3 o'clock in the morning, Mr. Dingley, exhausted from his all night vigil, but well satisfied with the result of his labors, sought much needed rest. On the 20th, President McKinley signed the Cuban resolution, and the war with Spain

began although a formal declaration of war was not made until five days later.

The preparation of the war revenue bill then began in earnest. The Republican members of the ways and means committee met in Mr. Dingley's rooms at the Hamilton house and perfected the first draft of the measure. The basis of it was the war revenue bill passed at the breaking out of the civil war. With his usual patience and skill, Mr. Dingley carefully mapped out every section, constructing it step by step with the accuracy of a trained hand. The rapidity with which Mr. Dingley worked and grasped the details of the situation, was a marvel to his associates; and when on the 23rd, after a conference with the president and the secretary of the treasury, he introduced his bill in the house, he was then complete master of its provisions, and the probable amount of revenue to be raised. Promptness in the preparation and introduction of the bill was necessary, for the 23rd was the day of the expiration of the president's ultimatum to Spain. The bill was referred to the committee on ways and means which considered the measure two days; and on the 26th it was reported to the house and referred to the committee of the whole on the state of the union. Mr. Dingley immediately gave notice that he would call up the bill the following day and ask for a final vote April 29. It was a matter of public comment that few men could have the confidence of the house as did Mr. Dingley in this great crisis. It was fortunate for the country that such a man was at the helm.

The bill was based on the estimates of the officials of the war and navy departments, that the war would cost about fifty million dollars per month. "It was thought desirable," wrote Mr. Dingley later, "not only as a measure of precaution but as a potent factor in creating the impression in Spain and Europe that this country had the ability and disposition to push the war with the utmost energy, to provide the means for carrying it on for at least one year, in case it should continue that length of time; and to impose such additional internal taxes as would strengthen the credit of the government by providing means for paying the interest and gradually extinguishing the principal of the necessary loans. To provide whatever additional means might be required to prosecute the war, the secretary of the treasury was authorized to borrow on the credit of the United States whatever amount should be required, not to exceed five hundred millions, and to issue therefor ten-twenty 3 per cent bonds, to be offered at par as a popular loan. An important section was added, not as a war revenue measure but

as a permanent provision to guard against any temporary deficiency of revenue in the future, authorizing the secretary of the treasury to issue one-year 3 per cent certificates of indebtedness, not exceeding one hundred millions to be outstanding at any one time—the object being to provide means to meet any temporary inefficiency of revenue to pay current expenditures, and thus avoid either bankruptcy or the necessity of using for this purpose the greenback redemption fund.”

The report accompanying the bill, written by Mr. Dingley, stated that “there is no doubt that if peace conditions had continued the estimate of the secretary of the treasury that the revenue for the next fiscal year would reach three hundred and ninety million dollars, exclusive of postal receipts, sixty-three million dollars in excess of the revenue for the fiscal year 1897, would have been more than realized.” He called attention to the fact that already the expenses for defense had been going on for nearly two months at the rate of twenty-five million dollars per month, and that the expenses would soon be much more. He added: “Your committee are of the opinion that the necessities of the country as well as the early successful conclusion of the war, call for such ample provisions both by taxation and authority to make loans for means to carry on naval and military operations as will impress the great powers of Europe as well as Spain with the conviction that the people of the United States are united in the determination to prosecute the war on a scale and with a vigor that makes prolongation of hostilities useless.”

Mr. Dingley’s speech ¹ April 27, opening the discussion of the war revenue bill, was listened to with marked attention by both sides of the house. He made a thorough explanation of the bill, analyzing its provisions minutely. There were frequent interruptions from Democrats indicating opposition to the measure. Mr. Dingley closed his speech with these words: “On Monday last by unanimous vote, we declared war. I trust that, having taken the responsibility of declaring war, having called out troops, having sent out armed vessels upon the broad waters to maintain the honor and dignity of the government, we shall now have patriotism rising to the height of the situation and having regard to the interests of the country, and that we shall have no more pettifoggery over old controversies revived, at least until the actual needs of the country in the present exigency have been provided for.”

The main point of attack was the section authorizing the sec

1—See Appendix.

retary of the treasury to borrow whatever amounts might be required, outside of the revenue from war taxes, to meet the expenditures of the war. An income tax was proposed instead of a bond feature; but Mr. Dingley replied that such a proposition would deprive the government in time of war of the means to raise money to meet expenditures, and substitute a tax which had already been declared unconstitutional. Then it was proposed by the Democrats that the so called "seigniorage" of the silver bullion of the treasury, estimated to amount to forty-two million dollars, should be utilized by using that amount of silver certificates against it. Mr. Dingley pointed out the danger of such a proposition, and it was voted down. Then it was proposed by the Democrats to issue one hundred and fifty million dollars in greenbacks or "fiat" money. This also was voted down. The debate on the bill April 29, was long and sharp. The Democrats and Populists exhausted every expediency to defeat the bond section, and they were aided by not a few Republicans who criticised the bill, and attempted to have it recommitted. But a majority stood loyally by Mr. Dingley in this trying hour. At four o'clock, when the time limit for debate was reached, Mr. Dingley had no opportunity to offer any of the important amendments agreed upon by the committee on ways and means; but the watchful chairman was equal to the emergency. He introduced an entirely new bill as a substitute, embodying the committee amendments. The minority objected to this move, but the speaker sustained his lieutenant on the floor. Then amid great excitement and confusion, the bill was passed by a vote of 181 to 131.

The Republican newspapers of the country agreed that Mr. Dingley never showed to better advantage than when he piloted this war revenue bill through the shoals and rocks in the house. He displayed rare qualities of leadership and won for himself added renown. The administration and the country did not err in relying upon his skill and judgment.

The majority of the senate committee on finance, composed of six Democrats and one Populist, considered the bill eleven days; and at the end of that time reported it back with the bond and certificate provision stricken out, and amendments for the issue of one hundred and fifty millions of new greenbacks and the immediate coinage of forty-two millions of so-called seigniorage from the silver bullion in the treasury, and the issue of silver certificates thereon. The five Republicans of the committee, composing the minority, reported in favor of the retention of the house certificate

and bond features. The bill finally passed the senate June 4, with the certificate and bond features retained and a modified seigniorage amendment added. The house, June 6, promptly voted to non-concur in the senate amendments, and the bill was sent to a conference. The conferees were Senators Allison, Aldrich and Jones of Arkansas, and Representatives Dingley, Payne and Bailey.

Washington was now throbbing with the excitement of preparations for war. The president had called for volunteers and every hour brought rumors of an impending clash of arms. The rush of applicants for commissions in the army was unprecedented, Mr. Dingley being overwhelmed with applicants from his own state. The emergency war fund had been exhausted and the president together with the secretaries of war and navy were contracting heavy bills which must be met. Still the senate talked; still the conference was prolonged. To deprive the treasury of the power to borrow in this emergency would have crippled the army and navy. To have attempted to conduct the war with fiat money would have been madness. To have coined the so-called seigniorage would have provided no new sinews of war and simply added to the embarrassment of the treasury. The senate was controlled by sympathizers with the silver and fiat money idea. How to deal with this factor in the problem caused Mr. Dingley many anxious hours. He entered the senate finance committee room, June 6, weighed with anxiety, and fearful lest the exigencies of this occasion would prompt the silver men to delay action or force some mischievous proposition.

The Republican conferees, led by Mr. Dingley, skillfully disposed of the less important senate amendments, leaving to the last the so-called seigniorage proposition. For three days the conferees struggled with the bill. Mr. Dingley scarcely took time for his meals. When in his study in the Hamilton house, he paced the floor nervously, thinking of the war revenue bill. He pondered more over the senate seigniorage amendment than anything else. He was at the conferences for three days and three nights, far into the night. It was long after midnight, June 8, when he wearily returned to his sleeping apartments, and threw himself on his bed.

"There," he said wearily, "we have practically reached an agreement after a three days pull,"

The night was warm and he did not get much sleep. He was far from well, and a distinct pallor was on his face. But, buoyed up by the tremendous excitement of the hour, he returned to the capitol the next noon ready for the ordeal.

As soon as the members of the house learned that the conferees had reached an agreement, there were frantic efforts to obtain the details. The corridors about the capitol were thronged with people more or less interested in the war taxes to be imposed under the conference report. When it was reported that the Republican house conferees had agreed to some sort of silver coinage, there were manifestations of a revolt against the acceptance of the report. The Republican members of the house gathered in little knots and discussed the situation. Some were outspoken in declaring that the house Republican conferees had made a fatal blunder—had misrepresented the majority. All that afternoon, Mr. Dingley was besieged with Republican members and agents of interested industries. He listened patiently to all complaints and heard without a murmur the mutterings of revolution against his leadership. At 5 o'clock in the afternoon he presented the conference report to the house, and the house took a recess until 8 in the evening. During this short respite, many of the leading members of the house told Mr. Dingley that they would not accept the conference report if it provided for the coinage of more silver dollars. Said one member: "Governor, you can never get the conference report adopted by the house. It is looked upon as a surrender to the silver men in the senate. The eastern sound money papers will denounce us if we accept this silver proposition you have agreed to. It is a serious party mistake."

On his way to and from dinner, Mr. Dingley was unusually quiet and thoughtful. An unmistakable look of anxiety was in his countenance. He realized the critical nature of the case and the great importance of passing at once some war revenue bill.

Debate on the conference report began at 8 o'clock in the evening. The house was brilliantly lighted and the galleries filled with visitors. Mr. Dingley opened the discussion calmly and hopefully. His face was pale with fatigue, and his stoop was slightly more pronounced than usual. He had a few figures and memoranda on his desk—nothing more. The members on both sides moved nearer as he proceeded with his words of explanation. In a clear business-like way he told of the result of the conference, touching upon all the provisions of the conference report save the most troublesome—the silver coinage provision. This Mr. Dingley called one of the compromises. Then he carefully reviewed the silver act of 1890, and the operations of the treasury department under it. Speaking moderately and deliberately, he told of the struggles of the house conferees with the senate conferees, and the final agreement to

coin at least a million and a half silver dollars out of the silver bullion already in the treasury, and withdrawing an equal number of demand notes. "Let me repeat," he said slowly, looking squarely at the Republicans who had declared the conference report would not be adopted, "there is nothing in the provision we have inserted here that is not already in the law of 1890, except this: There is a specific provision as to the minimum amount that shall be coined, and that minimum amount is based upon what has been coined. There is nothing in the substitute agreed to by the conferees, to which there ought to be any objection from those of us who propose to abide by the existing law and maintain all our currency as good as gold." After Mr. Dingley's full and convincing statement¹ of the case all threatened opposition disappeared. At 11:30 in the evening the conference report was adopted by a vote of 154 to 107. This was perhaps the most remarkable instance of Mr. Dingley's control over the house and the confidence the members had in him. The weary leader retired shortly after midnight and slept like one who had been relieved of a heavy weight of responsibility. The eastern sound money papers the next morning commended Mr. Dingley's work and the wisdom of his position on the question of silver coinage. The senate agreed to the conference report June 10, and three days later the bill became a law. Thus Mr. Dingley's name became linked with the tragic events of the summer of 1898. He fulfilled his promise to President McKinley that funds would be forthcoming when needed.

Speaker Reed was opposed to the annexation of the Hawaiian islands to the United States. His power as presiding officer and a member of the committee on rules, enabled him to retard the consideration of the Hawaiian annexation resolution. Mr. Dingley was not opposed to annexation, but felt that it would be hazardous to admit the Hawaiian islands as a territory. However he felt the pressure of public opinion and of the sentiment in the house; and in a note to the speaker urged him to yield and to permit the Hawaiian resolution to come up for consideration. This Mr. Reed did; and on the fifteenth of June the resolution passed the house by a vote of 209 to 91. The speaker was absent on account of illness, but requested the speaker pro tem to announce that if he were present he would vote "no."

Worn out by his work in Washington Mr. Dingley quietly returned to his home and his family on the 24th of June. Here he was welcomed by his proud constituents who met in Auburn the

1—See Appendix.

following day and unanimously nominated him for representative in congress for the tenth time. The resolutions declared that "again presenting Hon. Nelson Dingley as the republican candidate for congress, we take pleasure in recognizing the ability, fidelity and success with which he has so long represented the interests of the second district and the state of Maine, but also the interests of the nation." This was the first time since his first nomination in 1882 that Mr. Dingley had been present at his district convention, his public duties always detaining him in Washington. Such remarkable devotion and confidence was a theme on this day close to his heart; and in touching language he addressed ¹ the convention at some length.

Two days later he sought a brief rest in the wilds of Rangeley lakes. July 1 found him once more at his summer home on the coast of Maine. Here for the last time, he found that sweet repose which the cool sea breezes and the swash of the ocean gives. Here the peace of Heaven was near at hand.

1—See Appendix.

CHAPTER XXIV.

1898-1899.

In accordance with the provisions of a treaty between the United States and Great Britain, negotiated in May, 1898, President McKinley undertook the delicate task of appointing a commission to meet with a similar representation of the British government and Canada, with a view of arranging certain differences between the countries—many of them long standing. Early in July the president wrote Mr. Dingley urging him to accept a place on this commission. Mr. Dingley asked to be excused but the president so kindly insisted, that the former was reluctantly compelled to accept. He felt that his health would not permit him to undertake any more laborious and exacting work for some time. He longed for rest. He and his immediate friends feared that he was overtaxing himself; but in response to a sense of patriotic duty he accepted the commission. He was appointed July 19. The other members of the commission on the part of the United States were—Senator Fairbanks ¹ of Indiana, Senator Gray of Delaware,

1—Hon. C. W. Fairbanks writes as follows:

"Nelson Dingley was appointed by President McKinley a member of the United States and British joint high commission for the settlement of Canadian and Newfoundland questions. The commission met at Quebec in August, 1898, and at Washington in the following winter.

"Mr. Dingley addressed himself to the questions before the commission with great earnestness and great ability. The questions were of wide range. He showed the very greatest familiarity with them. His views were always expressed with clearness and force. He was direct and practical in his methods, and possessed the very cordial respect of all the members of the commission.

"In manner he was always frank, affable and courteous.

"He enjoyed the social functions, yet was rather reserved. He shrank from all suggestion of personal display. He was everywhere modest and easy of approach. He was an interesting conversationalist, occasionally given to humor. but as a rule, he preferred to deal with serious facts.

Former Secretary of State John W. Foster, Former Minister Kasson¹ of Iowa and T. Jefferson Coolidge of Massachusetts. The main points in controversy related to the Alaskan boundary, access to the Klondike region, the Alaskan seal fisheries, the northwestern fisheries, the use of the canals, relief to ship-wrecked vessels, etc. Mr. Dingley said on the day of his appointment, in reference to Canada's discriminating tariff against the United States: "It is plain that such a discrimination against imports into Canada from the United States when the United States makes no discrimination against Canada, if persisted in, will lead to retaliation on the part of the United States. For this reason undoubtedly the commercial relations between the two countries will very naturally receive the attention of the commission."

Mr. Dingley was summoned to Washington July 21, where the American commission was organized with Senator Fairbanks as chairman. The work was mapped out as far as possible, and on the 23rd Mr. Dingley returned to Maine. Ten days after the peace protocol with Spain was signed, namely on the 22nd of August, Mr. Dingley in company with his wife and daughter started for Quebec to attend the session of the Anglo-American commission.

The war with Spain was practically over; and Mr. Dingley joined in the widespread rejoicing. But he keenly realized the new national responsibilities. August 14 he wrote: "However much we have deprecated the outcome of the annexation of the Spanish insular possessions, however many of us may shake our heads at the difficulty, expense and danger involved, there is no escape from the responsibility; and it is more than probable that the events will make it clear that Providence has overruled all in the interests of humanity and civilization. The Philippine problem is the most serious one which the war has compelled us to face and

"He was essentially a student. His long public service, and many years devoted to the study of public questions and of history, as an editor, enabled him to interest all whom he chanced to meet.

"He neither in Quebec nor in Washington, indulged in self-exploitation. His own personality was never offensively pushed to the front."

1—Hon. John A. Kasson, special reciprocity commissioner, writes: "Congressman Dingley's appointment on the Canadian commission was made because as chairman of the ways and means committee of the house the president had great confidence in his knowledge of the industry and commerce of the country, etc. He was appointed with special reference to the proposed negotiation of a commercial treaty with Canada, and was chairman of the sub-committee in charge of this subject. His mind was open to all fair considerations on either side, and he yielded on some points with a liberality of concession which was unexpected by the Canadians from the author of the tariff act of 1897, and which showed an impartial appreciation of the business conditions of both countries. His manner was always conciliatory, and he gave frequent evidence of the possession of diplomatic sagacity. His relations with his associates on both sides were dignified and friendly to the commission."



INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION,
QUEBEC, CANADA, AUGUST, 1893.

it is by no means clear as yet what disposition of these islands will prove wisest and best. Many difficulties present themselves if we give them up, while on the other hand the Christian sentiment of the country is already raising the inquiry as to whether this nation ought not to look outside of its own case, and sacrifice something in the interest of humanity, wherever oppressed, even though the humanity which appeals to us is 8,000 miles from our shores. It is evident that this country has already entered upon a new phase of its national existence and that problems more serious in some respects than any we have thus far had, are facing us. We have faith, however, in the Anglo-Saxon race, and especially that composite part of it which has established and maintained this free government; and we doubt not that all of the problems which seem now to be so serious will be one by one successfully solved; and that ultimately this republic will be lifted higher, and civilization and human rights greatly advanced." Early in November, when it was ascertained that the peace commissioners had practically decided to retain the Philippine islands, Mr. Dingley wrote: "That there are serious objections to assuming the responsibility of governing or establishing a government in tropical islands so far removed from this country, and still in a low state of civilization, goes without saying. It does not necessarily follow, however, that even if we take the Philippines we are bound to make them an integral part of the United States; although for the time being we should have to maintain good order there. We have been in hopes that some way would appear by which the United States could simply take a coaling station and harbor of refuge in the Philippines, and the rest of the group be turned over to the people of the islands to govern for themselves. It is well understood that the president desired such a result. It may be possible to do this yet, but we must admit that the march of events has not been in this line—however much our burden would have been alleviated by such a conclusion."

Mr. Dingley's sojourn in Quebec, attending the sessions of the Anglo-American commission was an agreeable mixture of official and social functions. Accompanied by his wife and daughter, he thoroughly enjoyed his stay in that historic city from August 23 to September 2. The British-Canadian commissioners were—Right Hon. Baron Herschell, Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, ¹ Hon. Sir

1—Sir Wilfrid Laurier writes from Ottawa, December 31, 1900, as follows: "My relations with Mr. Dingley as a member of the Anglo-American commission were unfortunately too short to allow me the privilege of an intimate acquaintance with him, but so far as they went, I was always impressed with the sincerity, honesty and kindness of his character."

Richard Cartwright, Hon. Sir. Louis Davies, Mr. John Charlton,¹ M. P., and Hon. Sir James Winter. These were distinguished men who met during the eight days with their American brethren, to get acquainted and discuss the preliminaries of the negotiations. Dinners and receptions consumed a large share of the time, much to the enjoyment of Mr. Dingley's wife and daughter. While some of Mr. Dingley's associates eclipsed him in doing the social honors it was said by the Canadian papers that the "distinguished man from Maine was the best equipped mentally of the visiting American commissioners."

The practical results of this sojourn at Quebec were not very great, and after discussing the fishery, sealing, Alaskan boundary and the reciprocal question, the commission adjourned September 2 until September 19. On the twentieth the commission again met in Quebec, and for seventeen days divided the time between business and pleasure. There were dinners and balls and receptions and lunches. October 6 the American commissioners gave a dinner to the Canadian commissioners, and on the following day the commission decided to adjourn October 10, to meet in Washington November 18. Mr. Dingley, accustomed to prompt legislation.

1—In connection with Mr. Dingley's services as a member of the joint high commission, Mr. Charlton writes from Lynedoch, Ontario, as follows:

"The commission, as you are aware, met first at Quebec in August, 1898, and after remaining in session in that city for several weeks, adjourned to meet in Washington in November, where it remained in session till the following February, 1899.

"Mr. Dingley was well-known by reputation, to the Canadian members of the joint high commission, and their impression as to his views upon international trade relations, was that they would be of the extremest American protectionist type, and that the concessions, which Canadian public men deemed this country entitled to from the United States government in tariff legislation, would not receive the sanction of Mr. Dingley. This impression proved to be to a very considerable extent, an ill-founded one. It soon became evident to the Canadian members of the joint high commission, that Mr. Dingley had a great grasp of financial questions, and that he entered upon his duties, as a member of that diplomatic conclave, with a deep sense of the importance of promoting friendly relations between the two great nations of the Anglo-Saxon family. He was prepared, beyond question, to go to a greater length in the matter of fiscal concessions, than the senate of the United States were at all likely to approve of, if a treaty embodying his views were presented to that body for ratification. So deeply did Mr. Dingley impress the Canadian members of the commission with a sense of his fairness, and of a desire to go as far as his sense of obligation to his own country would warrant him, in granting modifications of the tariff system of the United States, that his death was looked upon with extreme regret, and was considered a very severe blow to the commission, and an event greatly lessening the probabilities of a favorable and satisfactory outcome of its labors.

"I noticed, at an early stage in the deliberations of the commission, that Mr. Dingley's views with reference to trade matters, were greatly deferred to by his fellow commissioners from the United States, and his death deeply impressed me with a sense of the loss that had been sustained in the removal of the most pronounced personality upon the commission, and the man whose views would not only have commanded respect, but would have gone far towards enjoining compliance from the legislative and executive branches of the American govern-

found little satisfaction in this English-Canadian style of diplomacy liberally seasoned with dinners. He returned to his home with the realization that thus far little had been accomplished. The round of social pleasures taxed his strength more than continuous work in the halls of congress.

Of the actual results of the work in Quebec, Mr. Dingley said: "While no definite agreement has as yet been made, good progress has been made and favorable results are hoped for. No serious difficulty has been met in reaching a tentative understanding on a majority of the twelve matters of difference. The four most important matters—the reciprocity question, the Alaskan boundary, the Alaskan seal fisheries, and the northeastern fisheries—are still in abeyance. The reciprocity question is still open. The difficulty of an agreement is increased by the preferential tariff in favor of Great Britain. The American commissioners are confined to efforts to have at least as much preference given to exports from the United States to Canada as is now given to exports to Canada from Great Britain, and also to have all export duties removed on articles exported from Canada to the United States. But of course if this be all that Canada has to give us, the concessions on Canadian exports to the United States must be very limited. If practicable, however, some limited agreement is much better than the commercial war which might follow the Canadian discrimination against

ment when the question of the ratification of the action of the commission came to be passed upon. One circumstance impressed me, when privately discussing international matters with Mr. Dingley, and this was the fact that he declared himself ready at any time to favor a Zollverein or commercial union between Canada and the United States, the only theoretically perfect and satisfactory system upon which free trade between the two countries could be established. Unfortunately the time had passed when such a proposition could be entertained by Canada, and the expression of his views while tentative and theoretical, gave evidence of great breadth of view.

"I was brought into intimate relations with Mr. Dingley during the sittings of the commission, especially at Washington, where we boarded at the same hotel, and occupied the same table in the dining room. I had known him quite intimately for some years before, having made his acquaintance first, in the year 1886. I consider that I was in a good position for forming an estimate of his character, and the conclusion I reached was, that he was a public man, who was governed by his convictions, and that probity and patriotism were leading features of his character. While, perhaps, not endowed by nature with a very unusual degree of mental power, he had made his way to the front through indomitable industry and energy. He was a close and diligent student, who worked out his cases thoroughly, mastering all questions with which he had to deal, and he had secured for himself the reputation of being an almost infallible authority upon financial questions. He was, in my estimation, a most remarkable man, and one belonging to that type of statesmen, who will always act as a safe-guard against popular recklessness, and all forces fostering national immorality, and who will exercise an influence in all cases, designed to promote the good of the community and of the nation."

us." Owing to his ardent espousal of a protective tariff, Mr. Dingley was charged with being unfriendly to close trade relations with Canada. The contrary, however, was true. He simply insisted that Canada should give the United States something in return for the admission of Canada's goods to the United States.

Mr. Dingley rested four weeks at his home in Lewiston, appearing in public but twice—lecturing before the students of Hebron academy and delivering an address to the students of Bates college.

From early manhood to the day of his death Mr. Dingley consecrated his life to his Divine Master. He lost no opportunity to tell in earnest words of the sanctifying power of the gospel. At home he was a regular attendant at church and joined his christian brothers in prayer. On the eve of his departure for Washington for the last time, he attended a service of prayer at the Pine street Congregational church, and exhorted all, especially the young men present, to avail themselves of every opportunity to promote the culture of their spiritual natures and thus build themselves up in the most holy faith. He then added: "If it were my last word to you, I would say, make it the business of your lives to build up noble christian characters, and you will never regret it." Thus his life was made potent for good through his love for and faith in the crucified Redeemer.

Mr. Dingley was, as usual, re-elected in September by a large majority. On the ninth of November he started for Washington to again meet with the joint high commission. November 12 the commission in a body called on the president at the White House. Senator Fairbanks formally introduced them to the president and the British and Canadian commissioners, and the executive received all with his usual ease and grace. On the sixteenth, the president gave a dinner to the commission in the state dining room of the White House. It was a very elaborate and enjoyable affair.

The commission secured quarters in the annex of the Arlington hotel, and resumed their deliberations. They met every morning behind closed doors, and often evenings, when social duties did not interfere. A dinner at Secretary Hay's, another at Senator Fairbanks' and still another at Mr. Foster's, deprived Mr. Dingley of his accustomed rest; and before congress assembled December 5, he was compelled to acknowledge that his health was somewhat impaired. Saturday night, December 3, he attended a dinner given

by the Gridiron club. It was a distinguished gathering of men, including the president and members of his cabinet, the visiting British and Canadian commissioners, General Garcia of Cuban fame, and the leading army and naval heroes of the war with Spain, including General Miles, General Shafter, Admirals Sampson and Schley. Mr. Dingley sat between General Miles and General Garcia. At midnight he retired visibly worn out. He looked careworn and overtaxed. His nearest friends expressed a fear that his health would give way.

Society was entirely foreign to Mr. Dingley's nature; and every formal dinner he attended was a severe tax on his strength. He was modest and retiring by nature, and did not enjoy the pomp and ceremony of formal social occasions. But social duties in Washington are as exacting as official duties; and membership on a joint high commission carries with it social duties equivalent to those of a cabinet officer or a foreign representative. Mr. Dingley was not accustomed to this—in fact during his long residence in Washington he rarely attended formal dinners or receptions.

The last session of the fifty-fifth congress assembled December 5 under circumstances of unusual interest. The same congress, six months before, had declared war against Spain; and now that the war was successfully over, congress met to confront for the first time, the grave questions developed by the eventful months preceding. As usual all Washington turned its attention to the capitol to witness the opening scenes. Long before noon the corridors were filled with surging crowds of people all pushing towards the galleries. The scene on the floor of the house of representatives was brilliant and picturesque. The members greeted each other with congratulations for victory or condolences for defeat. The political world as centered in congress is one ever-changing kaleidoscope. Members come and go; the leaders of today are forgotten tomorrow.

When Mr. Dingley entered the hall and joined the crowd of members, he received an ovation. He was greeted warmly by both Republicans and Democrats. All had affection for him rarely displayed in the field of politics.

The president's message referred to the fact that "notwithstanding the added burden of the war, the people rejoice in the steadily increasing degree of prosperity evidenced by the largest volume of business ever recorded. The finances of the government have been successfully administered and its credit advanced to the

first rank." The message brought into clear light the splendid results of the far-seeing labors of Mr. Dingley in the halls of congress. It was indeed a complete vindication of his wise policy.

The annexation of the Hawaiian islands and the probable ratification of the treaty with Spain, annexing Porto Rico and the Philippine islands, brought many new problems in connection with the customs and revenue laws. All these questions presented themselves to Mr. Dingley's active and analytical mind, with intense seriousness. He foresaw many of the difficulties that would follow in the wake of the war with Spain, but hoped that the atmosphere would soon clear. The attitude of the United States toward Cuba was also a problem to be solved, and the leaders of the embryo Cuban republic held frequent and long conferences with him in his committee room. His clear comprehension of the questions, was a marvel to all who conferred with him. The room of the committee on ways and means was turned into a general reception room every day from ten in the morning until late at night. Mr. Dingley's time and strength were taxed by delegations and members of congress, all asking for information and advice. He was sought after more than any man in congress. He carried in his head the figures of the reports of the treasury department; he held in his mind the decisions of the supreme court, and tariff schedules. He discussed intelligently, questions of constitutional law, and matters pertaining to the joint high commission. He listened to applicants for offices and kept close watch of the proceedings of the house. The physical and mental strain was tremendous. He put his best thought to every question and threw himself into his work as though his brain was of steel and his muscles of iron.

To be chairman of the ways and means committee and floor leader, during great national crises, is of itself enough to tax the strength of any man; but to add to this the responsibility of solving wisely and well, great fiscal problems incident to a decided change in governmental policy, and to carry the burdens of the details of an international commission and be largely responsible for the results, is more than one man should undertake. It was this multiplicity of cares and burdens, together with social demands to which he was unaccustomed, that finally proved too much for him to bear.

December 8, Mr. Dingley gave a luncheon in the house to the British and Canadian commissioners and their wives. Speaker Reed was an invited guest and entertained in his inimitable manner. It was a simple affair, where no wines whatever were served.

Mr. Dingley held the laboring oar on the joint high commission. It was upon him that the country and the administration largely depended not to permit a jug-handle arrangement. As the adviser of the American commissioners he was shrewd enough to have a tentative settlement made of all questions before taking up the subject of reciprocity. Outwitted by the American commissioners, the one hope of the Canadians was to secure concessions from the United States in the matter of reciprocity, of sufficient importance to offset antagonism to such manifest surrenders as were involved in the settlement of the north Atlantic fisheries dispute, the Behring sea seal fisheries and the question of war ships on the lakes. The Canadians began the conference having four main objects to secure—free lumber, free lead ore, free agricultural products and free fish. Three of these concessions were refused, while in the matter of agricultural products the American proposals were not what Canada hoped for. The Canadian commissioners were outmatched in diplomacy, and were not assisted by Lord Herschell, the British representative, who would not agree to anything that imperiled the continuance of the good will between England and the United States.

The import duty of two dollars per thousand on lumber (although less than the average rate per cent carried in the law of 1897) was attacked by a good many American lumbermen owning stumpage in Canada along the shores of the great lakes. Great pressure was brought to bear on the American commissioners to have this duty reduced. Mr. Dingley urged a yielding in this matter, in the hope that it might lead to a successful termination of the negotiations. But the Canadian commissioners, discouraged at the outlook and anxious to return to their homes, agreed to an adjournment December 20 until after the holidays. For four weeks Mr. Dingley attended the sessions of the commission in Washington. His courteous manner and his comprehensive grasp of the questions involved, won the love, respect and admiration of his associate commissioners. The commissioners separated, some of them for the last time, with the warmest regard for each other and hopeful that future deliberations might be productive of more tangible results.

The activity and fertility of Mr. Dingley's mind during these weeks of tremendous pressure and excitement, was a marvel to his family and friends. To members of congress and representatives of metropolitan papers, he gave much time to the discussion of the

problems of the future. He gave to a New York paper ¹ a remarkable analysis of the probable fiscal situation of "Greater United States," forecasting with wonderful accuracy the events of the future. He made perfectly clear the "open door" policy by saying: "It means simply equality of treatment and not free trade. As applied to the Philippines it would mean that imports from Great Britain and all other foreign countries are to be admitted at the same rates of duty as imports from the United States. Of course this policy could not be applied to the Philippines if they should be admitted into the union with a territorial form of government, because the constitution provides that duties shall be uniform throughout the United States. Whether it would be possible to apply this policy to the Philippines after they should become a part of the territory of the United States I am not prepared to say. It is noticeable, however, that in the resolution for the annexation of Hawaii, passed at the last session of the present congress, it was provided that the Hawaiian tariff shall continue in force until congress shall otherwise determine. It should be borne in mind however, that the present talk about an open door policy for the Philippines is intended to apply entirely to those islands while under a military administration, and do not apply to those islands after they have been formally recognized by congress as a part of the United States.

"Of course, it would be competent for the Paris commissioners to incorporate in the treaty with Spain a provision granting to Spanish imports into the Philippines equality of treatment with imports from the United States for a term of years, and that provision in the treaty, when ratified by the senate and projected into law by congress, would be the law of the land.

"In the discussion of the 'open door' policy, I notice that many papers assume that it is the uniform policy of Great Britain in her relations with her colonies. It should be borne in mind, however, that there is a conspicuous exception in this in the case of Canada, her most important colony, which admits imports from Great Britain at 25 per cent less duty than they are admitted from the United States and other countries. It is understood that this policy was adopted by Canada, if not on the suggestion, at least with the approval, of Mr. Chamberlain, British secretary for the colonies, and that he is urging other colonies to give a similar preference to that country.

1—The New York World.

"It should be borne in mind that a very vital point as to revenue is involved in the possible admission of Porto Rico, Cuba and the Philippines into the union as territories or states. These tropical islands are capable of producing every pound of sugar and many other tropical products that the United States consumes. If they should be admitted to the union in such a manner as to extend our tariff over them and thereby allow the free importation of their products, we would probably lose not less than \$60,000,000 of revenue annually, which would be a very serious situation under existing conditions.

"All of these difficulties only serve to emphasize the soundness of the suggestion that the true policy for the next year is to continue the military administration of whatever islands fall into our hands, and in the meantime make such a thorough investigation of every phase of the serious problems which must be met, which will properly prepare us to meet them with wise legislation."

Thus Mr. Dingley outlined his position and the wise policy for the country to pursue, before the treaty of Paris was ratified; before the controversy over the Porto Rican tariff had arisen, and before the cry of "anti-imperialism" was thought of. He was opposed to free trade between the new possessions and the United States proper. He was in favor of governing them as dependencies under the constitutional provision authorizing congress "to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property of the United States."

To a New York paper ¹ he gave the following hopeful New Year's sentiment regarding the national and commercial outlook: "The year 1899 gives promise of better times and a larger degree of happiness to the American people. As we look back over the century and note our marvelous progress, industrially and socially, we renew our faith in our future greatness and glory. We are on the threshold of a new era into which we have been ushered by the results of a victorious war. What this new era will bring nobody can foretell; but as we round out the nineteenth century and look with satisfaction upon the past we await the coming of the twentieth century with renewed hope and courage. The year 1899, with its new and perplexing problems, will again demonstrate to the world the power and possibilities of this great republic."

On the evening of December 13, Mr. Dingley presided over a Christian citizenship convention. His brief address was beautiful

1—New York Herald.

and lofty. On the evening of the fifteenth he dined with Vice President Hobart. On the following day he made a short speech¹ in the house on the bank bill. This was the last speech he delivered in the house. On the evening of December 18 at a Sabbath union meeting, in simple and touching language, he again told of his love of Christ and his faith in the cross. Those who heard him were moved to tears and many thought later that the great statesman had some premonition of the immediate future. At all events, it was deeply significant that his last public address was on a subject always nearest his heart and ever the key to his life—Christian consecration to daily work.

Congress adjourned for a brief holiday rest and Mr. Dingley gladly took advantage of it. He was tired mentally and bodily. The burden was greater than he could bear. The death of Senator Morrill of Vermont two days after Christmas, was an added shock to Mr. Dingley, for the venerable statesman was an associate of and co-laborer with Mr. Dingley, for years. They were warm personal friends; and few dreamed that these two men whose names were to be forever linked with notable tariff laws and great historical epochs, would soon be reunited on the other shore.

On the morning of the twenty-ninth of December, Mr. Dingley was first taken ill. He complained of severe pains and troubles in his head, but thought it was only a severe cold. On the thirtieth he was still confined to his bed, but as yet there were no serious symptoms. He was to have delivered an address¹ at the Brooklyn museum of arts and sciences January 6, but dictated a letter asking for a postponement of the event to January 20. He had thrown his whole heart and soul into the preparation of this address and felt keenly the disappointment. On the last day of December pneumonia developed and family and friends became alarmed.

The new year came and with it came more danger to the sufferer, and more anxiety for the wife and daughter who kept ceaseless vigil at his bedside. January 3 the stricken man was mentally disturbed and never again was completely rational. His mind wandered, and he continually talked about public matters—congress and the commission.

The news of Mr. Dingley's serious illness caused deep regret among members of congress who assembled again January 4. The blind chaplain in the house in his opening invocation, referred feelingly to the critical illness of Mr. Dingley and prayed fervently for his speedy recovery.

¹—See Appendix.

Two sons arrived at the bedside of their devoted father January 7. They brought comfort to the anxious wife and daughter, but could give none to the fond father. For five days the statesman's life hung in the balance. Everything that physicians' skill could suggest was done to cope with the dread disease. But his heart could not stand the strain and for four days he was kept alive by artificial means.

Anxiety over Mr. Dingley's illness was not confined to Washington nor to Maine. It spread throughout the length and breadth of the land. The president, members of the cabinet, members of the supreme court, diplomats, senators and representatives, called daily for reports from his bedside. Messages of hope and sympathy came from every quarter. The fear of his death chilled the heart of the nation. Never since Garfield, stricken by an assassin's bullet and hovering for weeks in the shadow of eternity, had there been such widespread anxiety over the condition of a public man. The universal sentiment was, that the country could not spare such a man as Mr. Dingley.

The fight which this apparently frail man made against death was remarkable. The anxious wife watched with aching heart the slightest symptom of an abatement of the disease. Once the weakened patient seemed to have some momentary return of consciousness for he slightly pressed the hand of his weeping wife and whispered her name. Sweet moment! That night was one of ceaseless vigil and anxiety. The worst was feared. At 9 o'clock on the morning of January 13, the patient had a sinking spell and it was then feared that the end was near. All day long that great brain wandered over the wide field of public events which it had so completely mastered. All day long that tender heart struggled to do its work. All day long hope grew fainter and fainter. The sun went down on a land blessed by this ebbing life. The stars appeared as if to guide him to the arms of the Almighty. An hour before midnight his spirit departed to join his sainted parents. Death came peacefully and he passed into eternity as one asleep. His life work was done.

Thus in the height of his power; when a grateful country crowned him as its most conspicuous benefactor; at the dawn of a new era in our national history requiring wise statesmanship, Mr. Dingley was called home. The news of his death cast a profound gloom over the city of Washington, and the whole nation. Mes-

sages¹ of sorrow came from every state and from abroad. President McKinley sent the following note, written with his own hand, shortly before midnight:

Executive Mansion, Jan. 13.

"To Dear Mrs. Dingley: I have at this moment learned of the death of your distinguished husband and write to express the profound sorrow which both Mrs. McKinley and myself feel for you in your great affliction.

"We mourn with you in this overwhelming loss which will be deeply felt by the whole country. From my long and intimate as-

1—Mrs. Dingley was in receipt of the following letters of condolence: —

State Department, January 14.

Dear Mrs. Dingley—My wife joins me in expressions of sincere sympathy in your profound grief. We have lost a great statesman, endowed with eminent gifts of mind and character. I hope it may be some consolation in your sorrows to know the whole country is mourning with you. I am, with heartfelt sympathy, sincerely yours,

JOHN HAY.

Navy Department, Washington, January 14.

My Dear Mrs. Dingley—I have called several times during Mr. Dingley's illness, and again this morning, on hearing of his death, to show the profound interest, which, in common with others, I have felt in his behalf. I know that no word can relieve your sorrow, but I take the liberty to express my sympathy, and also my appreciation of his long, useful and distinguished career. As a native of the district he so ably represented, and almost a neighbor, I know that among his constituents the news of his death will be especially deplored. There was no better man in the public service.

If I can be of any service, I trust you will command me, and believe me, sincerely yours,

JOHN D. LONG.

Treasury Department, Washington, January 14.

Dear Madam—While your family weeps, a nation mourns. The legendary ingratitude of republics is refuted. The character and public service of Nelson Dingley are appreciated, gratefully recognized and will not be forgotten. History will faithfully preserve the record of his intelligent seal and his loyal devotion to the public good.

I cannot forbear to put in evidence my testimony to his virtues. My relations to him were official rather than personal. Because of this, principally, I was enabled to comprehend the great reach of his mind, his vast knowledge of public affairs as related to questions of the National revenue and the public expenditure. His accurate judgment in all questions of currency and finance clothed him with conceded authority, while the purity of his personal character and the uprightness of his motives won the confidence and loving respect of all. Truly a great man has fallen. Your personal bereavement and the grief of his children may be assuaged—if any abatement can be found—in the fact that your loss is also our loss; that many, many thousands of whom you can never know, stand in reverent but tender sympathy, with your affliction. Sincerely yours,

LYMAN GAGE.

The Shoreham, Washington, January 14.

Mr. Dear Mrs. Dingley. I wish to say how much we all have felt the death of your late husband. For him I learned to feel a sincere regard. Our few months of association on the joint high commission has taught me to appreciate his worth as a man as well as a statesman. His surviving colleagues on the commission will doubtless unite in some fitting tribute of regard and respect for him, but I thought I would like to express to you and your daughter my own personal sympathy in this, your great affliction, and I know if my wife was here she would like to join her sympathy with mine. Believe me to be, yours faithfully,

L. H. DAVIES.

House of Representatives, Washington, January 14.

Dear Mrs. Dingley:—No death has occurred in years which has caused such sincere and profound sorrow as that of Mr. Dingley. No member of the house

sociation with him, it comes to me as a personal bereavement. A great consolation in this sad hour is a recollection of Mr. Dingley's exalted character, his domestic virtues, his quiet, useful, distinguished life and his long continued and faithful services in behalf of his fellow citizens who will always cherish his memory as that of a great statesman and true patriot.

"With sympathy, believe me, always, sincerely,

"Wm. McKinley."

Speaker Reed called to express his grief and sorrow. The last inducement for him to remain in congress was now gone. He declared that he had never seen deeper solicitude manifested for any man. "Mr. Dingley's loss will be deeply felt," he said. Other members of congress, members of the supreme court and many officials came to personally express their profound sorrow. Senator Hale said that "in the present condition of public affairs, Mr. Dingley's death is a great national loss."

The house met the following day under circumstances of deep and universal sorrow. The desk which Mr. Dingley had occupied of representatives has so thoroughly impressed himself upon the country as a conscientious and able statesman. Mr. Dingley and myself entered the LXXVth congress together, and his entire career has been a model for the people of our country to follow. We have many very excellent men in congress, but I fear it will be a long time before our country can boast of a man who has all the excellent qualities of your distinguished husband. My family and myself express to you our deepest sympathy. With very high regards, truly your friend,

JOSEPH WHEELER.

January 15, 1899.

Dear Mrs. Dingley: I hardly dare intrude on you at such a time, but I cannot resist the impulse to tell you how heartfelt is my sympathy with you in the terrible blow which has fallen upon you. It is scarcely six months since I first came to know him whose loss you are mourning, but the kindness and transparent sincerity of his nature soon won my real regard, and I feel that I have to deplore the loss not of a mere acquaintance but of a friend. The sense of personal loss for the moment dominates all else. But the members of the international commission who have enjoyed the advantage of his valued assistance will increasingly realize of how much they have been deprived.

Would that I could do anything to lighten your burden. Words, however sincere, seem on an occasion like this so cold and lifeless. But the consolations that are possible you have in abundance—the memory of a life devoted not to selfish aims but to public good, and the consciousness that multitudes are in their measure sharing your sorrow and honoring that memory. Believe me with deepest sympathy, very sincerely yours,

HERSCHELL.

Indianapolis, January 17, 1899.

Mrs. Dingley: I watched with the most solicitous anxiety the daily reports from your husband's bedside and received the news of his death with a deep sense of loss and sorrow. He was so wise and true and so much trusted that I could not believe he would be taken from us in the hour when the country most needed him. It will give you, after a while, comfort to know how he was esteemed and honored, but in the present, you will find that God's good promises and His grace are your only refuge. Will you please accept the sympathy of your friend,

BENJAMIN HARRISON.

Mr. Dear Mrs. Dingley: I cannot express my full sense of sorrow over the death of your distinguished husband. It is an irreparable loss to the nation and to every one of its citizens and as such lamented throughout the whole land. Very sincerely your friend,

GARRETT A. HOBART.

as floor leader of the house, in the center of the republican side of the chamber, was heavily draped in crepe¹ while on top was a profusion of flowers. As the speaker entered the chamber a hush fell upon the members as they rose and with bowed heads listened to the tender tribute from the chaplain who said of the departed: "He leaves behind a record of distinguished services and of unblemished

1—Congressman Champ Clark of Missouri, looked over from his seat on the Democratic side at the black draped desk of Mr. Dingley, banked with beautiful flowers, says the St. Louis Globe Democrat. A faint shadow—the suggestion which strong men give of stifled tears—crossed his powerful, clean cut face. It was gone with the instant, and then, as he settled back in his chair, his countenance was lighted with a gentle smile born of pleasant recollections.

"It is rather peculiar," he said, "how I came to know Gov. Dingley as he really was. When I came here to the forty-third congress I at once began to study character in the house. The study of character is a fad of mine. I have always been an observer of men, and, I flatter myself, I can size them up most as well as any man living. After I had been studying the big men of congress for two years I began to write about them for the public press. One of the first sketches I wrote was that of Gov. Dingley. I had sat in my seat for two years watching him, listening to everything he said, taking in all of his peculiarities, hearing what other people had to say about him, and I fancied I knew him. The sketch which I wrote was a cold-blooded analysis. There was nothing abusive in it—I meant to be entirely fair—but it depicted him in colors as somber as his public manner. His personality, according to my picture, was cold, intolerant, unkindly. So much for what I then thought of him.

"When I came back to this congress I was suffering from an affliction of the throat. Some one in the house recommended an old Dutch doctor here who is a specialist on throat diseases. I found out Dingley was going to this doctor for a similar affliction to mine. I asked him about the doctor, and he told me he had done him a lot of good. So I went to him myself.

"One day when Gov. Dingley and I met in the doctor's office a severe storm came up, and the doctor cautioned us against going out until it was over. There we were, stuck for an hour or more. I had read everything on the table, so there was nothing left for me to do but to talk to Dingley. I may say that conversation was one of the most interesting I have ever held with any man in my life. At its conclusion Gov. Dingley appeared to me in an entirely new light. I didn't know just what to talk to him about, and so I thought I would learn something from his vast experience.

"'Governor,' I said to him, 'suppose you knew a young man who had come to congress with great ambition to succeed in public life, and who had a reasonable assurance that he could stay there for a long time, what advice would you give him?'

"The philosophy of his reply was worthy of Bacon. 'Of course,' he said, 'I need not tell you that there are just four great committees in the house—the ways and means, the appropriations, the judiciary and foreign affairs.' He then went on to tell me the advantages of each, and the information he gave me showed a wonderful comprehension of all the possibilities. Then he said—and this is where the philosophy comes in:

"'In order to make a great name for himself in congress a man must be a specialist. I have been in congress for many years and I have watched and studied men as they have come and gone. It is safe to say, barring a few accidents, that every man elected to congress has a superficial knowledge of nearly every subject within the range of political affairs. I always listen to the first speech of a new member. When I have listened to him for ten minutes I can tell whether he possesses any special knowledge on the subject upon which he is talking. If I am satisfied that he has not, I never listen to him again. On the contrary, if he show a mastery of his subject, if he demonstrates that the knowledge he has is not the knowledge every other member has or could obtain by superficial inquiry, but that comprehension which comes from laborious and intelligent research, then I hear him out, and always listen to him thereafter. If a man be a specialist on a subject, if he knows more than the ordinary congressman knows or can hope to learn by mere dabbling, then he can compel congress to listen to him, and he rises to be a power. That is the secret of success here.'

"He then went on to tell me how he became a protectionist. 'I know you are a free trader,' he said. 'So was I when I came out of college.' This astonished

personal worth that becomes a part of the history of the country." After a brief and feeling announcement by Mr. Boutelle, the house adjourned as a further mark of respect. The senate also adjourned at the same hour.

The tribute paid the memory of this modest man on the sixteenth of January, in the house of representatives, where he had so long been such a commanding figure, was almost majestic in impressiveness. The president, his cabinet, diplomats, members of the supreme court, senate and house, and distinguished men in military and civil life, delegations from the business centers, were arranged about the bier on the floor of the hall,¹ while the galleries were occupied by the families of those upon the floor. Never before was such an honor accorded a member of the house. For an hour before the exercises began, thousands of people streamed through the main doors, and gazed upon the calm, serene features

me greatly. 'What made you a protectionist?' I asked him. His story was that when he came out of college he returned to his home some place up in Maine, and it was the transformation he saw worked out there under the Morrill tariff which converted him. The valley in which he lived—I can't think of the name—was rather a poor country agriculturally, was sparsely settled, and seemed to have no future. At that time we had the Walker tariff in this country, which was practically free trade. When the Walker tariff was repealed and the Morrill law went into effect, some manufacturers desirous of taking advantage of the new order came up into Mr. Dingley's country looking for a site for a factory. It happened that in this valley was an abundant water supply and the manufacturers concluded that they could do no better than locate there. The factory was built. It gave employment to a large number of men. They built their homes close by; they became consumers of the products which the farmers in that section could raise. To use Mr. Dingley's words: 'Where had been a desolate valley and a miserable people became a land smiling with peace and plenty, a population prosperous and happy.' This, he said, had led him to revise his views, and the more he studied the subject of protection and free trade from that time the more firmly did he become convinced that the greatest prosperity would come to the country through the policy of protection.

"We had been talking for an hour or more when the storm broke, and we bundled up to go. I always considered Gov. Dingley in a different light after that conversation. I had learned that when once you knew him you found a sincere, likable, kindly man."

1—Order of service at the funeral of Honorable Nelson Dingley, late a representative from the state of Maine. The house of representatives will meet at twelve o'clock noon, January 16, 1899.

The body of the late Representative Dingley will be placed in the hall of the house at 10 a. m., where it will lie in state.

The president of the United States and his cabinet, the Chief justice and associate justices of the supreme court, the diplomatic corps, the major general commanding the army, the senior admiral of the navy, and the commissioners of the District of Columbia have been invited to attend the services.

The president and cabinet will meet in the rooms of the house committee on naval affairs.

The supreme court will meet in the supreme court room.

The diplomatic corps, the major general commanding the army, the senior admiral of the navy, and the commissioners of the District of Columbia will meet in the ways and means committee room.

The pallbearers and committee of arrangement will meet in the house lobby.

The speaker's room will be reserved for the members of the family and the officiating clergy.

Seats will be reserved for those entitled to them upon the floor, to which they will be shown by the doorkeeper.

of the sleeping statesman, almost lost in loving flowers. An air of deep sadness pervaded the hall as the members rose to listen to the brief and simple prayer of the chaplain. Then a deep hush fell upon the assemblage. Suddenly out of the loft in the rear of the press gallery the notes of an organ echoed through the hall the first time in the history of the house of representatives. Then as that beautiful anthem "Crossing the Bar"—

"Sunset and evening star
And one clear call for me—"

was sung, many were moved to tears. ¹ Rev. S. M. Newman, Mr. Dingley's pastor in Washington, pronounced a most impressive eulogy.² At the request of the family, Mr. Dingley's favorite hymn "Jesus Lover of My Soul," was sung. Tenderly the form of their beloved and revered leader was borne by capitol police from the house of representatives to a special train in waiting.

It was a sad homeward journey for the devoted family and friends of the departed statesman. The bells of Lewiston tolled as the train entered the city. There, a great concourse of people as-

The senate will enter the chamber in a body preceded by their officers.

The president, cabinet, supreme court, general commanding the army, senior admiral of the navy, commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the family of the deceased will occupy seats on the floor of the house assigned to them by the doorkeeper.

The diplomatic corps will occupy seats on the right of the speaker of the house and in front of the senate and back of the president and his cabinet.

The senate will occupy seats on the right of the speaker of the house, the house of representatives on the left of the speaker of the house.

Upon the announcement by the speaker of the house the clergy will conduct the funeral ceremonies, and upon their conclusion the body will remain in the hall of the house until escorted to the station.

1—The night before he was stricken with his fatal illness, he sat in front of the open fire, complaining that he did not feel well. His daughter sat at the piano playing and singing new songs she had recently purchased. Among them was Neidlinger's rendition of Tennyson's sublime poem—"Crossing the Bar."

"Sunset and evening star and one clear call for me

And may there be no moaning of the bar

When I put out to sea.

But such a tide as moving seems asleep

Too full for sound and foam

When that which drew from out the boundless deep

Turns again home.

Twilight and evening bell and after that the dark

And may there be no sadness of farewell

When I embark.

For though from out the bourne of Time and Place

The flood may bear me far

I hope to see my pilot face to face

When I cross the bar."

In deep silence Mr. Dingley listened to the singing of these beautiful words. Awakening from his reverie he said softly: "Please sing them again for me, my dear. I am so fond of those words."

Like some soothing, gentle hand, the words and the music lulled him to sleep. At Mrs. Dingley's request this was sung at the funeral services in the house of representatives.

2—See Appendix.

sembled with uncovered heads and weeping eyes. Mr. Dingley was genuinely loved in Washington, but he was loved more in his own home. Here his form was tenderly borne to city hall and guarded by members of the Grand Army of the Republic and city police.

The scene in city hall was most impressive. In the center was erected a catafalque beneath which the sleeping man rested. Here thousands viewed with moist eyes the face of their friend and benefactor. One woman, plainly dressed, on reaching the casket fell on her knees, raised her hands above her head and exclaimed: "God bless the saviour of my husband and the friend of my son."

The day on which the earthly form of Mr. Dingley was placed in the tomb dawned fair and bright. All places of business were closed, and the mills, shops and factories shut their doors. Bells tolled solemnly and flags were at half mast. The people moved about with hushed voices and everything was still. After brief and private services at home the casket was removed to the Pine street Congregational church where the final services were held. There were delegations from congress, from the state government, many state organizations and many cities. Rev. George M. Howe, Mr. Dingley's home pastor made a touching and eloquent address drawn from his own intercourse with his departed friend. He closed with these words:

"We leave him in the presence of the glorified Saviour whom he loved so devotedly, and served so faithfully, and before whom we too shall stand at no distant day. Farewell, brother beloved! The world is lonelier and poorer for thy departure from it, but Heaven is richer.

"The Saviour's diadem is made resplendent with such jewels as thou art. We did not realize that the harvest season was so near. Thou hast gathered thy sheaves, and great were the rejoicings in Heaven at thy coming! 'The song that thou hearest was the seraphims' song,' a song mingled with the glad greetings of the loved ones gone before. 'Blest are the dead that die in the Lord.'"

Thus Nelson Dingley Jr., lived and died. He lived the life of a Christian statesman; and—

"Sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approached his grave
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

Fitting eulogies were pronounced in local, state and national organizations, state legislatures and institutions of learning. Gov.

Powers of Maine said in his proclamation: "Maine will never forget his devotion to his native state and her interests, and though dead he will continue to live in the grateful hearts' memories of all her citizens. In the halls of her legislature he began his distinguished honors; they have closed in the capitol, where he was a tried and trusted leader of his party in the national house of representatives. His integrity, devotion to duty, love of right, and justice, vast resources, sound learning, thorough mastery and comprehension of all questions relating to finance and tariff, commanded for him on all occasions an attentive hearing and made him a recognized authority, not only among his friends, but also his political opponents."

The public press ¹ teemed with tributes to his integrity and devotion to duty. The universal sentiment was that the nation owed his memory a debt that could never be paid.

February 11, 1899, the national house of representatives suspended business, and many members in heartfelt words, paid their tributes ¹ to the memory of their colleague. March 1, like eulogies ¹ were delivered in the senate. February 15, the Maine state legislature met to listen to tributes ¹ of a similar character.

Mr. Dingley's will, dated October 21, 1897, and written with his own hand, was brief and beautiful. At its close he penned these words: "In making the foregoing disposition of my estate at my decease, I have consulted what I have reason to believe would be the wishes of my beloved wife, and my dear children and the best interests of both. I have given the bulk of my property to my beloved wife because I know that all of my dear children would desire to see their mother first cared for in her declining years, so that she may be able to live in comfortable ease and maintain the family home as though I was alive; and because they understand that she will have an interest in them which none but such a mother can have and will use the means placed in her hands for their highest welfare as each may require; and that on her decease all of my estate that may then remain will pass to them. My strongest desire is that my children may maintain such a pure, noble and Christian life and character as will honor their father and make happy the last days of their mother and fit them for the life of Heaven where I hope through Christ's love to meet our reunited family."

Mr. Dingley's fame rests upon the eternal rock of character and conscientious industry. The record of his life is a spotless book

¹—See Appendix.

wherein one seeking truth, wisdom and inspiration may find them all. His speeches in congress have a permanent value to the student and historian. His public career forms a conspicuous part of our national history, and

“—If what we call

The spirit flash not all at once from out


This shadow into substance, then perhaps

The mellowed murmur of the people's praise—

May yet ascend to him.”



**STEAMER "GOVERNOR DINGLEY."
PORTLAND STEAMSHIP COMPANY.**



INDEX OF NAMES.

A.

Abbott, Nehemiah—51.
 Abbott, S. I.—83.
 Abbott, L. M.—460-461.
 Adams, John Quincy—22.
 Adams, Robert, Jr.—274-453.
 Aldrich N. W.—332-333-432-433-465.
 Allen, William—134.
 Allen, C. H.—238.
 Allen, J. M.—233.
 Allen, Elisha—235.
 Allison, W. B.—322-323-415-432-435-436-465.
 Ambler, John—219.
 Andrews, (Mc.)—90.
 Angell, J. B.—284-285-291.
 Appleton, John—162-163.
 Arthur, Chester A.—180-186-200-203-214-219-222-225-229-239-242-251-263.
 Asquitt, M. P.—341.

B.

Babcock, J. W.—365-382-383-384-385.
 Bacon, Rev. Dr.—122-123.
 Bacon, Henry—394.
 Bailey, J. W.—341-365-392-422-434-436-437-438-441-465.
 Baker, Smith—120.
 Baker, A. R.—326.
 Balkam, Rev. Dr.—46-52.
 Balfour, G. W.—361.
 Banks, N. P.—87-94-415.
 Barker, Lewis—157.
 Barrett, W. E.—329.
 Barrows, W. G. 165.
 Bartlett, Franklin—397.
 Bayard, Thomas F.—268-269-270-280-284-285-291-293-299-299-290.
 Bayne, Thomas—363-316-332.
 Bearce, H. N.—89.
 Beecher, H. W.—83-123-123-126-142-245-246.
 Belmont, Perry—322-363-363.
 Benson, Samuel P.—41.
 Berry, John J.—44.
 Bingham, H. J.—422-362-322-315-341-365.

Birney, J. G.—89.
 Black, Jeremiah S.—127.
 Blackburn, J. C. S.—200-222-254.
 Blaine, James G.—49-52-57-59-60-62-64-65-71-72-76-78-85-87-93-95-97-98-101-104-113-119-123-124-125-126-127-130-134-137-150-155-158-161-163-165-165-169-173-178-180-181-186-188-189-194-197-199-200-203-204-209-210-214-242-243-244-246-247-248-249-250-251-253-260-263-264-268-267-300-301-304-312-330-331-343-344-345-355-356-357-358-359.
 Blair, Austin—415.
 Blake, S. H.—60-61-65.
 Bland, R. P.—201-214-215-232-262-283-294-328-347-348-351-354-363.
 Blount, James H.—362-257-396-315-341-369.
 Boatner, C. J.—415-440.
 Bodwell, J. R.—170-232-272.
 Bond, S. R.—31.
 Boothby, Rev. Mr.—65.
 Boteler, A. H.—219.
 Boutwell, George S.—119 194.
 Boutelle, C. A.—124-163-219-222-242-247-263-287-301-309-315-341-364-382-468.
 Boynton, Nehemiah—386.
 Boyd, David—120.
 Brackett, George E.—120.
 Bradbury, James W.—61-121-265.
 Bradbury, Blon—60-64-65-73-80-172-264.
 Breckenridge, John C.—415.
 Breckinridge, W. P. C.—262-287-297-311-317-322-341.
 Brewer, D. J. 397.
 Brewer, M. S.—323.
 Brickett, Dr.—69.
 Bristoe, Benjamin F.—126.
 Brown, S. G.—336.
 Brown, J. B.—416.
 Brown, S. E.—157.
 Brown, J. M.—124-163-170.
 Brooks, Senator—156.
 Brumm, C. N.—276.
 Bryan, W. J.—341-342-350-365-371-381-407-415-445-446.

Buchanan, James—45-49-52-260.
 Buckner, S. B.—221.
 Buffum, Charles—117.
 Burchard, S. D.—260.
 Burrows, J. C.—200-201-202-203-203-215-
 216-222-232-241-244-250-415-421.
 Burleigh, John H.—76-112.
 Burleigh, E. C.—309.
 Burnside, General—75.
 Butler, Benjamin—249.
 Butler, Mayor—154.
 Butterworth, Benjamin—201-215-223-263-
 283-300-515.
 Bynum, William D.—263-287-303-313-364.

C

Carleton, S. L.—129.
 Cartwright, Sir Richard—472.
 Cary, Stephen—60-61-62.
 Cameron, Don—199-201-234.
 Campbell, J. E.—263-283.
 Candler, J. W.—223.
 Cannon, J. G.—200-222-243-287-315-322-
 323-333-453-461.
 Capen, S. B.—284.
 Carlisle, J. G.—300-211-231-232-233-242-
 253-254-257-242-255-279-284-287-239-
 315-316-320-322-340-354-358-382-394-
 395-415.
 Catchings, T. C.—228-241-264-258.
 Chadbourn, S. J.—61-100-121.
 Charlton, John—472.
 Champlain, J. T.—32.
 Chamberlain, Daniel H.—125.
 Chamberlain, Joseph—234-361-478.
 Chamberlain, Joshua L.—84-87-88-89-92-
 94-114-166-166-167-168-169-170-171-173-
 173-174-176.
 Chase, M. V. B.—73.
 Chase, Mr.—80.
 Chase, Solon—124-125-126-127-149-150-154-
 183-223-263.
 Chase, Charles H.—167.
 Chase, F. A.—111.
 Chandler, Zachariah—155.
 Chandler, W. E.—214.
 Cheney, O. B.—73.
 Choate, Rev. Dr.—284.
 Choate, Rufus—23.
 Churchill, John Randolph—362.
 Clark, E. L.—336.
 Clark, Champ—484.
 Clarkson, J. S.—244.
 Clay, Cassius M.—249.
 Clay, Henry—39-415.
 Cleaves, Henry B.—112.
 Cleveland, Grover—245-248-249-250-253-
 256-257-258-261-262-267-272-276-279-
 280-286-293-296-305-307-309-340-341-
 349-351-353-354-355-359-360-364-365-
 367-368-369-371-373-374-377-378-379-
 381-383-391-397-399-402-403-411.
 Coburn, Stephen—54.
 Coburn, Abner—11-64-65-67-70-71-156.
 Cobb, S. W.—241-415-440.
 Cobb, T. R.—217.
 Cobb, Francis—124.
 Cobb, Rev. Dr.—336.
 Cockran, W. B.—253-371.
 Cockrell, F. M.—574.
 Colfax, Schuyler—93.

Collins, P. A.—254-262.
 Comfort, L. C.—18.
 Conger, O. D.—222-224.
 Conger, E. H.—237-323.
 Conkling, Roscoe—126-126-127-127-127-127-
 128-128-204-205-210-415.
 Converse, George L.—241.
 Cony, Samuel—67-71-73-75-76-78-82.
 Connor, Seiden—61-120-121-122-127-128-
 134-136-142-146-157-162-247-263-264.
 Cook, Silas W.—177.
 Coolidge, T. J.—470.
 Cornwallis, Lord—217.
 Cousins, R. G.—265.
 Coudert, F. R.—397.
 Cox, S. S.—194-201-202-202-207-219-220-222-
 224-225-226-231-232-232-232-234-241-241.
 Coxey, J. S.—375.
 Crapo, W. W.—300-304-214-221.
 Crisp, Charles F.—231-263-287-315-317-
 340-341-364-388-390-391.
 Crosby, William G.—26-28-36.
 Crosswell, Senator—82.
 Culbertson, D. B.—232.
 Cullom, S. M.—374.
 Cummings, A. J.—328-315-341.
 Curtin, A. G.—201-223-263.
 Curtis, Charles—239.
 Curtis, George W.—242.
 Curtis, Jeremiah—39.
 Cushman, Ara—69.
 Cutcheon, B. M.—262-282.

D

Daisell, John—223-315-365-328-390-391-
 415-418-419-422-423-424-440-461.
 Danforth, Charles—165.
 Daniels, J. W.—234.
 Dana, John W.—11-59.
 Dargan, G. W.—294.
 Dawes, H. L.—227-415.
 Davies, Sir Louis—473-482.
 Davis, H. W.—415.
 Davis, C. K.—460.
 Davis, Jefferson—61.
 Davis, Woodbury—42.
 Davis, C. H.—24.
 Davis, Daniel F.—150-155-156-173-174-
 175-175-180-181.
 DeArmond, D. A.—341-364-388.
 Dibble, Samuel—238.
 Dickey, William—263.
 Dillingham, W. A. P.—73.
 Dingley, Frank L.—67-391.
 Dingley, Jeremiah—83-171.
 Dinsmore, H. A.—461.
 Dockery, A. M.—238-238-341-346-364-374-
 383-401-402-404-483.
 Dodge, William E.—205.
 Dolph, J. N.—266.
 Dolliver, J. P.—315-341-364-383-391-415-
 419-420-423-423.
 Dorsheimer, William—253-267.
 Douglas, Fred—223.
 Douglas, Stephen A.—39-40-53-59.
 Dow, Neal—51-130-131-263.
 Dow, Fred N.—101-195.
 Dresser, Richard—43.
 Drew, F. N.—101-190.
 Drummond, J. H.—124-264.
 Drummond, Rev. James—32-42-44.

Hepburn, W. P.—200-222-242-264-282.
 Hewitt, A. E.—201-207-211-215-216-218-222-242-271-280.
 Hill, George F.—177.
 Hill, D. B.—260-240.
 Miscock, Dr.—238.
 Miscock, Frank—201-208-218-222-223-261-262-232-257.
 Hitt, R. R.—147-227-231-262-287-315-241-288-290-454-455.
 Hoar, E. Rockwood—119.
 Hoar, George F.—119-209.
 Hoar, Sherman—241.
 Hobart, G. A.—405-490-482.
 Hogan, Mr.—180.
 Holman, William. E.—200-219-222-223-223-256-262-265-287-315-241-242-247-264-274.
 Holland, Daniel—72.
 Hopkins, A. J.—232-287-315-241-264-222-321-415-422-424.
 Horr, R. G.—201-207-208-219-257.
 Howard, M. W.—402-428.
 Howard, General O. O.—75-251.
 Howard, Joseph—82.
 Howe, J. H.—125.
 Howe, G. M.—239-427.
 Hoyt, J. S.—190-241.
 Hubbard, John—12-13-120.
 Hulick, G. W.—287.
 Hull, J. A. T.—241-223.
 Hunt, Carlton—225-255.
 Hurd, Frank H.—232-278.
 Hyde, T. W.—169.

I.

Ingalls, Henry—177.
 Ingalls, John J.—229.
 Ingersoll, Governor—119.
 Ingersoll, Robert G.—126-127.

J.

Jameson, C. D.—59-64-65.
 Jefferson, Thomas—216-274.
 Jewett, Mr.—65.
 Jewell, Marshall—194.
 Johnson, Thomas—241.
 Johnson, H. U.—249-244.
 Johnson, M. N.—265-291-415-422.
 Johnson, Andrew—75-76-82-85-87-90-91.
 Jones, John Paul—299-228-235-424.
 Jones, James K.—200-274-424-465.
 Jordan, Eben Jr.—74.
 Joy, William P.—181-182.
 Joyce, Mr.—205.

K.

Kasson, John A.—200-201-202-211-222-470.
 Keifer, J. Warren—201-202-204-207-208-210-222-231-222.
 Kelley, W. D.—76-201-202-207-222-262-297-215-216-241-215.
 Kent, Edward—3-102-118.
 Kenner, D. F.—219.
 Kilpatrick, General Judson—74-98.
 Kimball, Charles B.—28.
 Kimball, William J.—118.
 Kimball, John S.—129.
 Kimball, Benjamin—18.
 Kingsbury, Benjamin—60-61.
 Knott, J. Proctor—200.
 Knowlton, Ebenezer—41.
 Knox, Henry—210.

L.

Lacey, J. F.—215-264-282.
 Ladd, George W.—142-123.
 La Follotte, Robert—216.
 Lamson, James B.—166-162.
 Lana, Thomas—42.
 Lapham, E. G.—195.
 Laurier, Sir Wilfrid—471.
 Lawson, Sir Wilfred—147.
 Lawson, Dr.—284.
 Lee, Fitzhugh—457.
 Lee, R. E.—81-85.
 Libby, Artemus—165.
 Lincoln, Abraham—54-56-57-62-65-69-70-71-72-74-75-76-77-78—80-81-82-128-202-261.
 Lincoln, Robert—261.
 Lindsey, E. D.—127-142-150-156-157-178-125.
 Little, Edward T.—74.
 Littlefield, Charles—112-226.
 Lochren, William H.—269.
 Locke, Joseph A.—171-174-175.
 Lodge, H. C.—237-215-241-446.
 Logan, John A.—182-190-201-244-415.
 Long, John D.—155-222-242-252-261-262-287-422.
 Lord, Charles N.—177.
 Lowell, L. L.—111.
 Luce, Enos T.—54-82.
 Lyford, J. S.—82.
 Lynch, J. R.—222-244.
 Lynch, John—61-74-76-87-92-95.

M.

Madigan, James C.—112.
 Manley, J. H.—123.
 Manning, Daniel—411-414.
 Mason, Col.—74-117.
 Mason, W. E.—156-287-411.
 Mathews, Stanley—122-209.
 Mayo, J. M.—124.
 McAdoo, William—263.
 McAlvey, Judge—297.
 McCall, S. W.—265-288-289.
 McCleary, J. T.—265-288.
 McCreary, J. B.—287-217-241-282.
 McClellan, George B.—77.
 McConnell, Mr.—225.
 McDonald, Moses—92.
 McDowell, Alexander—265.
 McFarland, Henry—440.
 McKenny, Henry—42.
 McKenna, Joseph—262-287-216-290-429-440.
 McKinley, Wm.—155-201-211-222-261-262-272-282-294-315-316-318-320-222-224-225-226-228-230-232-233-234-252-252-253-405-406-408-409-410-411-413-414-415-417-420-421-422-424-425-426-427-429-431-432-433-441-445-448-454-455-456-458-461-467-469-472-483.
 McLaurin, J. L.—291-415-422-440.
 McMahon, W. H.—219.
 McMahon, Mr.—297.
 McMillin, Benton—201-211-222-262-265-266-257-215-224-222-240-241-249-249-288-291-415-422-434-438-440.
 McLane, R. M.—222.
 Meade, George D.—74.
 Meiklejohn, George D.—265-282.
 Meridith, Mr.—286.

Miles, N. A.—475.
 Miller, Warner—222-223-228-244.
 Milliken, S. L.—124-219-223-243-247-262-287-315-341-354-358.
 Milliken, Weston F.—99.
 Mills, R. Q.—223-263-265-272-288-293-301-302-304-305-308-315-323-324-323-340-341-415.
 Money, H. D.—383.
 Morley, John—361-362.
 Moody, Dwight L.—123-398.
 Moody, W. H.—452-453.
 Moody, E. C.—155.
 Moore, John W. C.—66.
 Morgan, J. T.—461.
 Morse, Leopold—333.
 Morse, F. H.—51-54.
 Morrill, H. K.—125.
 Morrill, Lot M.—18-43-50-51-53-54-57-60-74-75-82-97-113-121-156-162-163-265.
 Morrill, Anson P.—24-32-39-60-113-121-154-244.
 Morrill, Nathum—35-36-41-42-44-83.
 Morrill, Paul S.—91.
 Morrill, S. P.—62.
 Morrill, J. S.—415-420-450.
 Morrison, William R.—200-222-223-236-241-245-245-251-253-255-271-275-277-276-278-279-280-296-415.
 Morrow, W. W.—257.
 Mortland, D. N.—99.
 Morton, L. P.—301-303.
 Morton, Oliver P.—125-126.
 Munson, H. C.—123-130.
 Murch, Thomas—143-183.
 Murray, General—101-126.

N.

Nelson, Knute—363.
 Newlands, F. G.—401.
 Newman, S. M.—438.
 Nimmo, Joseph—230.
 Noble, Dr.—336.
 Northrup, Dr.—326.
 Nourse, Amos—50.
 Nye, Joshua—89-129-131-132.

O.

Oates, William C.—262-267-315-326-341-344.
 Ochiltree, T. P.—232.
 O'Donnell, James—263-268-215-341.
 O'Farrell, Charles T.—304.
 Oliver, Henry W.—219.
 O'Neil, John J.—341.
 O'Neil, Charles—341.
 Orth, G. S.—201-207.
 Osgood, J. K.—181.
 Outhwaite, J. H.—298-341-363.

P.

Packard, Dr.—384.
 Page, H. F.—202-223-225.
 Parker, James—223.
 Parris, V. D.—62.
 Patten, George F.—50.
 Patten, Parvis—245.
 Payne, S. E.—232-263-316-336-365-338-390-391-415-415-413-423-423-434-460-461-465.
 Payson, Mr.—30.
 Payson, L. E.—263-287.

Peck, Bishop—127.
 Peck, George W.—119.
 Peel, B. J.—336.
 Perkins, F. C.—117.
 Peters, J. A.—65-74-76-87-92-95-165-264.
 Perham, Sidney—41-42-65-76-83-87-93-94-95-96-97-98-99-101-123-156-190-283.
 Perry, J. J.—32-41-53-143.
 Phelps, John S.—219.
 Phelps, W. W.—222-263-283-294.
 Phelps, E. J.—230-231.
 Phillips, Wendell—34.
 Pierce, Franklin—27-39-40-91.
 Pike, Frederick A.—60-76-87-113-187.
 Pike, Austin F.—232.
 Pillsbury, Eben F.—67-83-92-156.
 Plaisted, H. M.—89-121-123-127-128-190-223-223.
 Platt, Thomas C.—196.
 Platt, O. H.—423.
 Pleasanton, A. J.—74.
 Plumb, P. B.—223.
 Polk, James K.—415.
 Porter, Robert P.—219-246.
 Porter, Noah—123-123.
 Porter, J. A.—439.
 Porter, Fitz John—223.
 Powell, A. M.—205.
 Powers, Llewellyn—127-142-150-423.
 Prince, Job—45-50.
 Proctor, Redfield—336.
 Pulitzer, Joseph—263.
 Pulsifer, J. D.—49-126.
 Putnam, William—264-264-264.

Q.

Quint, Dr.—326.

R.

Randall, S. J.—201-202-211-221-232-233-241-251-253-263-273-273-279-280-282-294.
 Randolph, John—415.
 Raum, Green B.—223.
 Ray, George W.—365.
 Reagan, J. H.—232-242-263.
 Record, Calvin—44.
 Reid, Whitelaw—300-245.
 Reed, A. R.—111.
 Reed, Isaac—33.
 Reed, Franklin—133-194.
 Reed, Thomas B.—89-113-127-142-150-155-156-157-162-182-187-193-200-202-205-207-219-223-222-247-253-255-261-262-275-276-277-287-298-309-312-315-316-319-322-324-330-336-323-323-341-245-347-364-371-372-375-383-389-390-391-399-401-404-405-406-412-415-422-427-428-430-431-432-433-435-439-441-443-455-456-457-458-461-467-476-483.
 Rice, John H.—60-76.
 Rice, William W.—263.
 Richards, F. E.—117.
 Richards, J. T.—163.
 Richardson, J. D.—263-283-315-341-365-374-388.
 Riddleberger, H. H.—306.
 Roach, John—224-239.
 Roberts, Charles W.—96.
 Robeson, George M.—202-207-210-222.
 Robertson, S. M.—423.
 Robertson, Judge—194-209.

Van Buren, Martin—39.
Vance, Z. B.—332.
Vest, George G.—222-228-246-434.
Vickery, Isalah—2.
Vilas, William—269.
Virgin, Dr.—384.
Virgin, Judge—153-159.
Vose, E. K.—7.
Voorhees, D. W.—143-221.

W.

Wadsworth, J. W.—423.
 Wakefield, J. W.—190.
 Waldron, William H.—83-43-44-51.
 Walker, Mr.—60.
 Walker, Joseph—328-338.
 Walton, C. W.—58-59-60-65-161-165-170.
 Wallace, Mr.—146.
 Ward, Artemus—323.
 Ward, Rev. Dr.—334.
 Warner, A. J.—232-257-263.
 Warner, George—117.
 Warren, Rev. Dr.—122.
 Washburn, W. D.—335.
 Washburn, Israel Jr.—11-12-41-51-53-54-54-57-59-60-41-154-415.
 Washburn, Ruel—33.
 Weaver, J. B.—232-237.
 Webster, John H.—43.
 Webster, Daniel—26-28-39-208.
 Webb, Nathan—74-76-80-86.
 Webb, Edmund J.—83.
 Weed, W.—7.
 Weeks, George E.—175.
 Wells, Samuel—39-41-43.
 Weller, L. H.—337.
 Wellman, Walter—353-400.
 West, Sackville—270-284.
 West, William H.—344.
 Wheeler, F. W.—341.
 Wheeler, William A.—219.

Wheeler, Joseph—200-202-203-262-287-315-341-364-322-321-415-422-424-440-453.
 White, Andrew D.—397.
 White, S. M.—434.
 Whitehouse, Hiram—30.
 Whiting, William—263.
 Wilson, Nathaniel—363.
 Wilson, Edward—78.
 Wilson, F. H.—422.
 Wilson, Henry—27.
 Wilson, James—439.
 Wilson, W. L.—232-263-268-297-315-341-365-371-372-377-378-381-415-440.
 Williams, Joseph H.—50-64-71-75-104-128.
 Williamson, Henry—117.
 Williams, George F.—341.
 Williams, Rev. Dr.—336.
 Winans, Edwin B.—263.
 Windom, William—223-252-326-411-414.
 Winter, Sir James—472.
 Winthrop, R. C.—415.
 Wise, George D.—263-341.
 Wolcott, E. H.—335.
 Wood, John M.—41-51.
 Wood, Judge—123.
 Wood, Fernando—155-211.
 Wood, Rev. Mr.—32.
 Woodbury, Levi—235.
 Woodford, Stewart L.—127-122.
 Woodman, T. C.—83.
 Wright, J. B.—333.
 Wythe, Judge—123.

GENEOLOGY.

CHAPTER I

History mixed with tradition says that the Northmen who dwelt in what is now Denmark, Sweden and Norway ten centuries ago, first sailed along the shores of what is now New England. They found a climate so mild, a region so delightful, with fruit and vine so abundant that they called it Vineland. Centuries rolled away and Vineland was forgotten until the Cabots in the last decade of the fifteenth century seeking a passage to India skirted the coasts of Maine and Massachusetts.

The English claim to North America was based on these discoveries by the Cabots in 1497 and 1498, yet the first Englishmen who set foot on its shores were part of the crew of the "Mary of Guilford," a vessel commanded by John Rut, which with the "Sampson" sailed from Plymouth, England, June 10, 1577, in search of the north-west passage. They sailed towards Newfoundland where a great storm left the "Mary of Guilford" to continue the search. From Newfoundland she sailed southward returning by the coast of Cape Breton and Norumbega, often entering the ports, landing men and examining the country, finally reaching England in October.

At this time Norumbega was the name given sometimes to Maine. Milton immortalized its name in "Paradise Lost," and many fabulous descriptions of its capitol, "The Lost City of New England," are given in the stories of American history.

1602 Bartholemew Gosnold sailed along the shores of Maine from Penobscot Bay to the Piscataqua river. In 1606 the English, alarmed at the efforts of the French in this new country, reached out for a firmer occupation of the coast. George Weymouth was despatched nominally to discover a north-west passage but really to watch the French and occupy the territory for the Crown. Captain Weymouth took possession of the country and began a valuable commerce with the Indians. From his vessel "The Archangel" Weymouth first landed on the Island of Monhegan, ten miles off the coast, and erecting a cross thereon, dedicated the land to King James I of England. Weymouth visited and explored many other islands in this vicinity, including Squirrel Island, which, over two hundred and fifty years later, was the summer home of Nelson Dingley Jr.

The stories of this fair new world told by Weymouth were of all-absorbing interest in England. Speedily an association of English gentlemen was formed to plant colonies in this new Eden. There were many Christian English gentlemen who desired to send glad tidings of joy to the inhabitants of these new regions. The Plymouth Co., composed of intelligent and far-seeing men, was formed, to send to these new shores the farmer, the carpenter and the school-master as well as the Bible, the Christian teacher and the organized church.

The English settlement of Maine antedates by more than thirteen years that of Massachusetts. May 31st, 1607, eighteen days after the sailing of the

Jamestown colony, two ships, "The Gift of God" and "The Mary and John," commanded by George Popham and Raleigh Gilbert, sailed from Plymouth with 120 souls to found a new colony. This colony was established at the mouth of the Kennebec river and was named Fort Popham. Their minister, Richard Seymour, an Episcopalian, by prayer and sermon dedicated the spot and inaugurated their government. They fortified the ground, erected a fort of twelve guns, built a village of fifty houses, a church, and a thirty ton vessel, "The Virginia of Sagadahoc," the first ship built in America by Europeans. Disheartened and discouraged, the colonists dispersed and the colony perished. Popham died broken-hearted. His expectations were not realized. No friendly hand conveyed his remains to England. No monument has ever been reared to his memory. The storms of winter and the suns of summer beat upon this sandy shore; and after a lapse of over two and a half centuries, this historical spot where was enacted one of the great tragedies of life, has become a health-giving resort for many people.

Captain John Smith whose life was saved by Pocahontas, the daughter of the Indian chief, Powhatan, visited the shores of Maine in 1614 and entered upon a traffic with the Indians between Sagadahoc and the southern part of Massachusetts.

November 3, 1620, a second charter was given to the Council of Plymouth formed in the west of England, granting a certain tract of land to be known as "New England in America." The name originated with Captain John Smith, who from 1606 to 1616, was the greatest of American explorers. The name was favored by the English sovereign and has been indelibly stamped upon this section of America, of which Maine has been an important part. Sir Ferdinando Gorges and Captain John Mason were prominent members of the council of Plymouth. The former was a man of intellect and courage, a most brilliant naval officer and a leading spirit in many prominent historical events in England. His ambition was to create a new nation in the barbaric lands of America. A patent was given by King James to Gorges and Masons "Of the country between the Merrimac and Kennebec to the farthest head of said rivers and sixty miles inland," and all islands, etc., within five leagues of the shore, which the indenture says "They intend to call the Province of Maine." During 1622 and 1623 trading stations were established at Piscataqua, Monhegan and Saco. At this time, Damariscove and Fisherman's Island, within two miles and in clear view of Squirrel Island, had a thrifty and enterprising population. This region was more conspicuous and important than Plymouth. Pemiquid was probably the busiest spot upon the New England coast. It became the center of commerce and trade. Sewell, the historian, thus writes of this historical place: "About this devoted spot armies have gathered like eagles to the carcass, and the din of war, in all its accumulated horrors of blood and carnage, has raged. The ships of contending nations have tinged its waters with human gore and poured their iron hail in destructive broadsides upon its fortified places, till the ruthless storm has swept its streets and crushed out at once the lives and energies of its defenders. Here the red man with a howl of defiance, and the white man with the subdued voice of prayer, have bitten the dust together, amid the shrieks of forlorn women and helpless children."

A description of this region is interesting from the fact that Nelson Dingley Jr., over two hundred and sixty years later, with a few associates, purchased Squirrel Island in the center of this historical spot, and made it their summer home. The cottage erected thereon by Nelson Dingley Jr. was occupied by him and his family every summer from 1871 to 1898; and here Mr. Dingley sought complete rest from his arduous and exacting public duties. On this historic island, surrounded by his wife, his children and his grand-children, he loved to listen to the stories of the ancient dominions of Maine.

From 1622 to 1632, Gorges and his associates secured other patents of land in the territory, now the state of Maine. In 1631 "The Pejypscot" patent of 1,500 acres on the north side of the Androscoggin river was granted to one Richard Bradshaw, to include "Lands not formerly granted to any other." On the Pejypscot or Pejepscoot (now the Androscoggin) river and in the territory covered by the Pejypscot patent, Thomas Purchase settled about 1628. In the course of time the Pejepscoot company came into possession of the land, and at the instigation of the company, the general court of Massachusetts sought to settle

disputes between it and the early settlers, who were of the opinion that the lands they occupied were government property. Many of these settlers had bought their farms of former occupants and supposed their titles were valid; but in numerous cases they were obliged to pay the Pejepscot proprietors, or surrender their land. Exasperated at the course of the general court at Boston they committed many acts of violence on the proprietors, frequently destroying their property. These manifestations of violence culminated in a riot in Lewiston in the autumn of 1800. The disputes were finally settled by a commission appointed by the governor and about twenty thousand acres of land were conveyed to the settlers by virtue of the conditions stipulated. Thus ended a controversy extending over nearly a century and participated in by three generations. Substantial peace followed.

During this period (1700 to 1800) there was a steady emigration to the wild lands of the district of Maine, and the valley of the Androscoggin received its share. Sewell says: "The colonization and settlement of Maine was rather a commercial and patriotic movement, than the result of a religious exodus. The first settlers within the ancient dominions were not refugees from religious intolerance, and of course were neither enthusiasts nor bigots, to one of which extremes unbridled religious excitement ever leads. No traces of the blood-red hand of persecution have ever been found on the early colonial records of our state. The fact that the colonial enterprises for the settlement of Maine were the developments of a commercial, rather than a religious element may account for this pleasing feature in the earlier character of our plantation contrasted with those sterner, darker and more doubtful shades of the colonial history of Massachusetts."

In the closing years of the 17th century and the first half of the 18th century (1690 to 1750) several settlements were undertaken on both sides of the Androscoggin river. Brunswick and Topsham advanced the most and were the centers of trade and civilization. Then followed (1750 to 1800) the settlements of Turner, Greene, Poland, Lewiston, Port Royal (Livermore), Thompsonborough (Lisbon), Littleborough (Leeds) and Pejepscot (Danville). Among these settlements was Royalsborough, established in 1760 and incorporated as Durham in 1789. This was the birth place of Nelson Dingley Jr.


CHAPTER II.

The earliest mention of any Dingleys is in connection with the Parish of Dingley in Northamptonshire, England. In Whalley's history of that country mention is made of about seven generations from Alured de Dinglial, A. D. 1197, to Thomas de Dyngel, Rector Ecclesiae de Dyngel, circa 1400, A. D. A preceptory of the order of Knights Hospitallers had been founded, (it is not known by whom) in the parish of Dingley in King Stephen's reign, 1135-1154. Soon after (1269) the Hospitallers possessed one manor in the parish, and the family of Dingley the other. At the time of the death of Thomas the Rector, the whole property in the parish seems to have passed to the order. There was a member of the family—a John Dingley—a Knight Hospitaller. There is mention of him in the chronicles of Henry of Knighton (1368), and the archives of the order now preserved in Malta have been searched (by the courtesy of Sir Adrian Dingil, Chief Justice of Malta) and a letter¹ has been found addressed to Brother John Dingley, preceptor of Dalby, from the then head of the Order of Rhodes, bearing date 20th of February, 1265.

Whether the modern Dingleys descended from the Northamptonshire family is still an open question; but all the Dingleys, Dineleys, and Dyneleys (for the name is thus variously spelled even now) now existing are the off-spring of Henry de Dyneley of Cliriger in Lancashire, who lived in the time of Henry III, 1216-1272; but whether he was an off-shoot of the Northamptonshire family and gave his name to a village now called Dinnley (then Dyneley) or whether the place was so called before and he took his name from it, cannot at present be decided with certainty.


Habington, the Worcestershire historian, who lived about 1650, was of the opinion that the Worcestershire Dineleys, or Dingleys, were originally from Dingley in Northants, and says that Mr. Henry Dingley of Hanley castle, "A gentleman expert in armory and the deviser of his brother's tomb in Cropthorne church" was of the same opinion. Some later writers have disputed this, as a letter has been discovered from Henry Dingley to Sir Simon Archer in which he says that the Worcestershire Dingleys came from Dounham in Lancashire. So they did, no doubt. But that is no reason that the families did not originally spring from the Northamptonshire line which is traced back at least two generations further. The Dyneleys of Cliriger became extinct in six generations—about 1420. The Dyneleys of Dounham remained there until about 1550, but before this one or perhaps more members migrated to Yorkshire—one, Richard, in the reign of Edward III to Charlton in Worcestershire; and either a son of his or more probably a younger brother, into Kent; and his early descendants

1—The earliest Dingley relic yet discovered is a letter to John Dingley, a Knight of St. John of Jerusalem (otherwise called Knights Hospitallers, and later Knights of Malta) from Raymond Berenger, the then head of the Order at Rhodes, 20th of February, 1265. The search which found this letter was instituted by Sir Adrian Dingil, G. C. M. G. and LL. D., Chief Justice of Malta, where the records of the order are now preserved.



Vera F. Higney Roberts (1892-1914)
 in 1892-1914
 In with John of the John Dingley of Vera, Mass.
 Edward H. Higney & Co. New York City
 N. Y. 1914 by Mrs. Higney of St. Francis

ROBERTI DINGLEI, R. DINGLEY, ESQ.
 TOMB OF FRANCIS DINGLEY AND WIFE.



in Richard II's reign (1377-1399), became possessed by marriage of Wolverton in the Isle of Wight.

The Yorkshire family was divided into several branches, who distinguished themselves from each other either by differencing the original coat of arms or by assuming different crests. The only branches found named are those of Melbourne, Suillington, and Branhope; but there were others. At Melbourne they have gone and left no trace behind them, either in the parish registries or in monuments in the church. No information can be obtained from the Suillington branch, and the Branhope branch is only just extinct. The last, Robert Dingley, died in 1861. His sister's son, born in Chamberlain, took the name of Dingley by royal license, and now (1896) his only son lately died childless, and his widow is living somewhere near Dover.

Another of the Yorkshire branches was represented a few years ago by the late Major General Henry Ellenborough Dyneley. He was born in 1829. He died about 1893. The only clue as to which branch he belonged to is that the crest he used is the dragon's head based on a wreath, not out of a coronet, as the Southern Dingleys have it. He had a sister, an old lady, and she was still living in London in 1896, in a sort of sisterhood.

From the visitation of 1569 many interesting facts concerning the Dingleys of Charlton in Worcestershire are gathered. Some time in the reign of Edward III (1327-1377) a Richard Dingley whose descendants claimed that he came from the family at Dounham, came into Worcestershire and married Eleanor, daughter and heiress of Sir Symon Hondesacre, or Hansacre, of Charlton, and with her inherited Charlton house and estate. (Charlton is a hamlet in the parish of Crophorne, Worcestershire). From Richard Dingley who lived in the time of Edward III to Francis Dingley, so called both on his monument and his will, are eighteen generations. He died in 1614. There were three generations more of male Dingleys after him and then Charlton passed, with another Eleanor, the daughter of Sir Edward Dingley, Knight, to the Goodyeres in 1632, thenceforward known as Dingley-Goodyeres. ² A terrible tragedy took place a generation later when one Goodyere brother killed the other and was hung for it; and the Charlton estate was sold. The last (till lately) known Goodyere was the son of the murderer, a highly eccentric chevalier of the last century, who called himself Sir John Dineley, dropping the Goodyere. He was one of the "Poor Knights of Windsor." He died unmarried in 1806.

The tomb ³ of Francis Dingley in Crophorne church is still well preserved. He and his wife are on an altar and his nineteen children kneel around him.

1—Abstract of the will of Francis Dineley of Charlton County, Worcester, Esq. This is described in the Prerogative court of Canterbury, now lodged in Somerset House, London. The reference to it is P. C. C. 100 Byrde.

First. I bequeath my soul to God, etc., etc.

My bodie to be buried in Chopthorne church, where my seal now is. As for my goods I bequeath them in manner and for following: I give my geldinge to Philip Dingley my son, and to Anthony my son £200. All the rest of my goods I give Elisabeth my wife, whom I make sole executrix.

Francis Dyneley.

3rd November, 1632.

15th June, 1664, administration of the goods of Francis Dyneley, left undisturbed by Elisabeth the relict, was granted to the niece, Elisabeth Bearcroft.

2—Marriage license in the registry of the vicar-general of Canterbury, granted to the last Dingley of Charlton, and showing that though her descendants were called Dingley-Goodyeres, yet Dingley was the official spelling.

Goodyere, Edward (Goodyere) of Burhope, Colfeord, gentleman, bachelor, about 22, and Miss Helen Dingley of Charlton, County Worcester, spinster, about 18, with consent of her father, ——— Dingley, of the same esquire at Bodenham, county Hereford, 21 January, 1670.

3—The inscription on the tomb of Francis Dingley who died in 1642, is supposed to have been written and the tomb designed by Henry Dingley, of Hanley Castle, his brother younger by three years than himself, but surviving him sixteen years, dying in 1660. It is as follows: "To the during memory of Francis Dingley, Esq., nobly descended on both sides, deriving his masculine line from the ancient family of the Dineleys or Dingleys of Lancashire, which was since yet more ennobled by many honorable and worshipful matches as of Hansacre, deduced from the ancient kings of Scotland, Throgmorton, Rous of Ragley,

Three are in small cradles level with the heads of the others; they can hardly be discerned. The nine sons were:

Henry, eldest son, born 1561.
William, probably second son.
Thomas, third son, born 1567.
Giles, born 1590.
Francis,
Edward,
John, born 1594.
Antony, baptised 1595.
Philip, born 1603.

The seven daughters were:

(1) Eleanor, who married Francis Egstone; (2) Mary, married Francis Eaton; (3) Elizabeth, married ——— Hazelwood; (4) Ann, married Richard Skinner; and Magdalen and Katherine, married, the one Richard Millington and the other Samuel Bigge, but which was which is not now known.

Of the nine sons, four only are mentioned in the visitation of 1632, viz.: Henry, who though dead, was the parent of the next generation in the direct line; William, who married Dorothy Kelley, and left sons and daughters; Antony and Philip, also married, with a family; Edward, died before 1632, but is mentioned in his mother's will; Thomas, who was an Oxford man took the degree of B. C. L., and the peculiar B. C. L. gown on the third son can be seen on the monument. He was rector of Monks Resborough in Buckinghamshire. Of the remaining three sons, Giles, Francis and John, it can be stated with reasonable accuracy that the latter, John, is the one who emigrated to America and from whom the Dingleys in America are descended.

In 1632 and just after, the Worcestershire Dingleys were a most extensive family. George Gifford Dineley, a London barrister was descended from Francis Dingley. One of his ancestors was Mark Dingley, the grandson of Henry, the eldest son of Francis. An extract from the will of said Mark Dingley dated in 1632 shows the acknowledged relationship between the Dingleys of Worcestershire and those of Wolverton and those of Yorkshire.

There were about twenty families of Dingleys living in Birmingham, England, and its neighborhood. None of them know anything of their ancestry; but there is little doubt that they sprang from the Dingleys of Charlton. In Thomas Dingley's "History from Marble," a curious book left in manuscript by a certain T. D. of the Wolverton branch who lived about 1690, is a description and picture of Charlton Manor house.² This Thomas Dingley,

Tracey, Hardevieke, St. Nicolas, Neville, and Bigge. By his feminine line from his mother Mary, daughter of Sir Edward Neville, lineally descended from Joan de Arce, daughter of King Edward I. From Joan, daughter of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, fourth son of King Edward III, and Constance, daughter of Edward Langley, duke of York, fifth son of King Edward III. Her mother was Eleanor, daughter of Andrew, Lord Windsor.

"He happily matched with Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas Bugge, Esq., (descended from his mother's side from the noble family of Gruges, Galway, Bracey alias Brace) and Magdalen Hoby his wife, by whom he had issue eleven sons and eight daughters, and with whom, having spent the space of fifty years in comfortable wedlock, he died in peace, leaving behind him the precious memory of a zealous patriot, a worthy justicer, a true friend to true religion, and a great example of valour and wisdom.

"Elizabeth, his late consort, hath consecrated this mean monument of her love and his merits."

1—Extract from the will of Mark Dineley, great-grandson of Francis Dingley, proved 1632, in the probate court at Worcester:

After bequeathing his property to his nephew, Josiah Dingley, who did succeed him, and failing him, to one or two other near relations, and failing them to the eldest male heir of my grandfather, Henry Dingley. Failing him, to the eldest heir male of my great-grandfather, Francis Dingley. Failing all these to the eldest issue male of the eldest family of the Dyneleys or Dingleys of the Isle of Wight. Failing any of these, to the eldest issue male of the eldest branch of the Dyneleys or Dingleys in the County of York. And in default of such issue, to our sovereign Lord, King Charles the Second."

2—Thomas Dingley's "History from Marble" contains a very interesting sketch of Charlton, the old Manor house of the Dingleys, in the parish of



TOMB OF FRANCIS DINGLEY AND HIS WIFE.

ley was an antiquary and a traveler and left behind him six manuscript volumes. The Camden society some years ago published this "History from Marble."

Soon after the Goodyere tragedy, when Charlton was sold, it was occupied by a family of Dingleys as tenant farmers, and three generations of them lived there until about 1860, when it was again sold and they were turned out. An old Mr. William Dingley, who with his daughter lived (1894) at Ledbury in Herefordshire, was born in the old house. They have lost their record but claim to be descended from one of the eight sons of Henry, the son of Francis Dingley, but they cannot say which.

The Dingleys of Wolverton have always been regarded by historians as a younger branch from Charlton, and they bear the same arms and crest precisely, but they go back so far as to be almost if not quite coeval with them. The first Robert Dynley mentioned may have been the son of Richard of Charlton, but as among the many other coat of arms they are not entitled to quarter, those of Hansacre of Charlton are not claimed by them, and a son of Richard's would certainly quarter those coats. It may be that they descend from a younger brother of Richard's. A picture is given of a brass in Standford Dingley church in Berkshire, of Margaret, the wife of William Dyneley, who died on the 7th of August, 1444.

A great-grandson of Sir John Dingley of Wolverton was Robert Dingley, a rich merchant of London, a governor of the Bank of England, a Fellow of the Royal Society (F. R. S.) and the principal founder of the great charity, the Magdalen hospital. A portrait of Robert Dingley is now preserved in the board room of the Magdalen. He had one son and four grandsons, who must have either died sonless, or emigrated as no trace of them whatsoever can be found.

The Cornish Dingleys all sprang from a William Dingley, who came into the country and married a Cornish wife in 1575. Whether he was the son of James or Richard, the sons of Mark Dingley, is not clear, but the Southampton Dingleys now extend descent from the one and the Cornish Dingleys from the other. The Cornish family, about 1700 divided into two branches. The elder branch was a hundred years ago extensive, but after the manner of the family dwindled, and it has now, 1894, only one male representative; he had uncles and cousins but they have utterly disappeared.

In the year 1637 when the first Dingley is known to have emigrated from England to America, there were Dingleys in Yorkshire, Worcestershire, Hampshire, the Isle of Wight, and in Cornwall. The John Dingley who went to America did not come from the Cornwall Dingleys because he was a High Church

Cropthorne. About one half of the principal structure was in 1867, standing, having been remodeled both without and within early in the last century. The original hall, of which the tall window is seen in the appending view, is gone, and the ancient gate-house which occupied the center of the area has been removed. The less ancient boundry wall in front with its two pillard gate-ways is still standing. So are the adjoining porter's lodge, of timber and brick, and the dove-cote behind it, which is of stone. This mansion, which had been relinquished to farmers from about 1780, is now (1867) undergoing the process of renovation with more than usual regard to its old features, at the hands of Henry Workman, Esq., late of Everham, by whom the Charlton estate was purchased in 1864.

The Workmans subsequently sold the estate to other parties.

1—The brass of Margaret Dyneley, in Standford Dingley church is the oldest Dingley monument known. The inscription without contractions, is as follows:

Subiacet hoc lapide Margaret Dyneley tumulata
Quondam Willmi Dyneley conjux vocitata
Armegei Regio. Modo reynulus esca pavata
M Domina C quater X quater L, cadel illa
Romana festo. Jesus ergo sul memor esto.

The translation:

Beneath this stone lies buried Margart Dyneley
Formerly entitled wife of William Dyneley
Esquire of the King. But now food ready for worms.
She dies in (the year) of our Lord MCCCCXXXIII (1444)
On the feast of St. Romanus (9th of August). Jesus therefore
have mercy on her.

The feast of S. Romanus (9th of August) occurs within the octave of the greater festival of "The Name of Jesus," the 7th of August, and this explains the special invocation of the Holy Name.

clergyman, and suffered much for his opinions, and would by no chance have joined the Puritans; furthermore there are records of this John Dingley subsequent to 1638. The John Dingley of the Wolverton branch on the Isle of Wight was born in 1590, knighted in 1614, and was deputy governor of the Island in 1642, so that he could not have emigrated. There was, however, a John Dingley missing from the Dingleys of Charlton in Worcestershire, and this in all probability is the John Dingley who emigrated to America in 1637. This John Dingley was a son of Francis whose children have already been mentioned. From their surroundings and relationship this family of Francis Dingley, it is fair to judge, were Royalists and Churchmen, certainly anti-Puritan; but Col. William Dingley, 1 nephew of Francis and first cousin of John was a distinguished soldier in the service of the parliament and therefore not a Royalist, so it is quite possible that some of his cousins might have been the same. 1

The will of Francis Dingley is very short. He only mentions two of his sons, and leaves everything else to his wife. The inference, therefore, is that he had provided for all the others in his lifetime, and that they were independent and could do as they liked. 2

1—The epitaph of Col. William Dingley in Hanley Castle church speaks of his noble nature to his endeared country and adds: "Neither was he wanting to the Civil government, being enrolled a Justice of Peace and quorum for this county, of which in peace and war he was most highly esteemed." Col. William Dingley died May 6th, anno 1653.

2—From the fact that the family of Francis Dingley were Royalists, it does not follow that they were anti-Puritans. There was a great difference between the Pilgrims and the Puritans. The Pilgrims fled from England to escape religious persecution. They first went to Holland and thence to America, settling in Plymouth in 1620. The Puritans founded the Massachusetts Bay colony in 1629-30. They had the approval of the English throne and were a large and well-equipped company. They were actuated largely by a religious motive. Yet primarily, theirs was a commercial colony, and they did not seem to disavow the state church. It is therefore probable that John Dingley, who came to America in 1637 was one of the Puritans and a member of the Massachusetts Bay colony. He was a royalist and a churchman, it is true, and he must also have been a Puritan. Rev. Samuel Dingley evidently assumed that because John Dingley was a royalist and churchman, he must have been anti-Puritan. But such was not the case.

3—The first Dingley to be found in the records of the University of Oxford is: Dingley, Roger, B. A. (Supplicated 24 June) 1506. Fellow of All Souls Coll., 1511. M. A., 29, November, 1512. Guardian of the Ruthberry Chest in summer 1514. Proctor, 1518. B. D., 16 June, 1532. D. D., 11 June, 1536.

Elsewhere he is said to have been chaplain to Henry VIII.

4—Most of the information contained in this chapter relative to the early history of the Dingley family in England was obtained through the industry and courtesy of Rev. Samuel Richard Dingley, a retired clergyman living in 1896 at Hampton-on-Severn, Gloucester, England, who wrote to Hon. Nelson Dingley Jr. as follows:

The Denhalls,
Hampton-on-Severn,
Gloucester, Eng.
Stonehouse,
Gloucester, Eng.

December 27, 1895.

My Dear Sir:

I have just seen your name on the enclosed newspaper slip. I, too, am a Dingley, but I did not know that there were any of our family in America, though I was aware of some who had gone to Australia. Would you mind telling me what you know of your ancestors, and when they left England? There have been Dyneleys or Dingleys of Yorkshire, Dinleys or Dingleys of Charlton in Worcestershire—claiming by various marriages three royal descents—Dingleys of Wolverton, in the Isle of Wight, who have the blood of Charlemagne, all having a common ancestor in Henry de Dyneley of Cliriger in Lancashire, who lived circa 1250 A. D. I come of an offshoot of one of these which has been in Cornwall since about 1600, A. D. Of these Cornish Dingleys I know nearly everything. Of the other branches I know a good deal, and should much like to find your place in the family tree.

Francis Dingley. ob. Oct. 1824 æt. 74




1 DINGLEY of Charlton
2 Fosse de Capel
3 Lord
4 Fitzherbert & Wodehouse
5 Cornu & Hault
6 O'Connell
7 HANDSACRE
8 Charlton

9 HARDWICKE
10 Glendree
11 Champaine
12 Martin
13 NICOLAS
14 Macdonald
15 Macdonald of the Hill
16 Hawley

17
18 Kellan
19
20 Kellgren
21
22 Kellan
23
24 Kellan.

CREST OF FRANCIS DINGLEY.



CHAPTER III

John Dingley, the ancestor of the Dingley family in the United States, was born about 1608 and died in 1658. He came over from Lynn, England, to Lynn, Massachusetts, with a company of emigrants in 1637. Lynn was then a portion of the Massachusetts Bay colony, settled by the Puritans in 1633-1630. Although the members of the company were Puritans, adherents to the established church of England and probably Royalists, circumstances were too much for them; and as they learned of the religious freedom of the colony at Plymouth and appreciated the fitness of the latter's religion and customs for their social condition, they gradually adopted both. In 1640 the company at Lynn removed to Sandwich (Cape Cod) and became practically a portion of the Plymouth colony. In 1692 the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay colonies became actually one.

Thus John Dingley, while not a Pilgrim and a member of the original Plymouth colony, was a Puritan and a Plymouth Pilgrim by adoption. The original Lynn company was at Lynn only three years, and there are few if any records of it in the history of that period. The real history of the Dingleys in America begins in the town of Marshfield, Massachusetts, whence John Dingley with two associates came from Sandwich in 1640. This was soon after Marshfield and Duxbury were erected out of parts of old Plymouth. John Dingley was a blacksmith by trade, but united with his trade the cultivation of the soil—a lot of land having been granted him by the town. This farm in Marshfield has ever been known as the Dingley homestead, and the old house was occupied until recently, by the only survivor of the family in that region, an aged woman. John Dingley is named on the first book of the Marshfield records as paying rates or taxes, in 1648, and was styled "Goodman Dingley." He was something of a politician or village statesman, for he is mentioned as being often chosen to fill responsible offices in the town. He died in 1658 about fifty years old. His wife's name was Sarah, but her maiden name, and the dates of her birth, marriage and death are missing. Although many old tombstones in the

If you care about these things I could tell you much of great interest, and should be much pleased to do so. I, myself, am a priest of the Church of England—old, slightly crippled, retired from active service, married but with no children. I have a small but sufficient income, so that I want nothing of anyone. The occupation of my old age and leisure time is family history, and whenever I hear of a strange Dingley I want to know who he is. I trust you will pardon my intrusion and also any informality in the address of my letter. I have no idea of your christian name, nor do I know what style or title may be your due. Hoping to hear from you, believe me, yours very truly,

Samuel Richard Dingley.

To this letter Congressman Dingley replied with cordial thanks, also conveying to his kind English family-friend all the information in his possession touching the Dingley family in America. Replying to Mr. Dingley's letter the English rector, February 17, 1896, sent a second letter to Congressman Dingley containing much of the information which is given in these pages. The editor of this work is therefore deeply indebted to this English rector for valuable information concerning the early history of the Dingley family.

Marshfield churchyard dating back to the seventeenth and eighteenth century, bear the name of Dingley, there is nothing to indicate the maiden name of John's wife or the date of their marriage.

John and Sarah Dingley had five children—two sons and three daughters: John Jr., who died in boyhood, in 1655; Mary, who died in 1655; Sarah, who married William Ford and who died in 1737; and Hannah, who married Josiah Keen.

It is of historical interest both to the Dingleys and to all New England, to know that Mary Dingley, daughter of John Dingley, played an important part in the early history of the Plymouth colony. There are no more sweet and tender stories of the early Pilgrim days than appear in Jane Austin's "Betty Alden," called the first born daughter of the Pilgrims.

Miles Standish, one of the heroes of that period, had lost his beloved daughter Lora; and Betty Alden was chosen to comfort the wounded soldier; and to Myles she recounted in tender language the last words of Lora, which were:

"Thy Mary and not Sally that will comfort him best. She'll be a daughter to him in a place next to mine. Tell him so."

Myles covered his face again, and for some moments Betty sat in respectful silence, then, moving nearer, laid a light touch upon the shoulder heaving under its mighty struggle for self-control.

"Not in Lora's place, dear sir," said she softly. "No one can take that e'en if she would, and Mary Dingley would not if she could. I know her well, and a milder, gentler, sweeter maid no longer lives on earth. She is one who will ever bear your grief in mind, yet never speak of it; one who will give you a daughter's duty and tendance, yet never press you for a daughter's freedom; one who will love you as much as you will let her, yet never be nettled at thought you do not love her as you might. She is as fond of Josiah as woman can be of man, yet modest and meek and shamefast as a maid should ever be. Oh, sir, she is a girl among a thousand I do assure you, and if you will open house and heart to her you shall never, never repent of it."


The stern Myles had forbidden his son Josiah to bring his sweetheart, Mary Dingley, home, but his iron will and heart were softened by the tender words of Betty, and the love-match between Josiah Standish and Mary Dingley was agreed to and blessed.

The following from the pen of Jane Austin beautifully describes the scene of this early romance in which Mary Dingley became the bride of Josiah Standish, uniting the families of Standish and Dingley:

"The lime tree has shed not only flowers but fruit, and the bees are adding to their clover and clover honey a last deposit from the latest hollyhocks and golden rod. The apples lie in fragrant piles beneath the orchard trees, or in a less worthy heap beside the cider mill; the maize and the pumpkins gleam in merry gold, exulting over the withered foliage that in their non-age flaunted above their heads; the barns are bursting, and the cattle sleek with plenteous corn; it is the jocund time of year when mother earth spreads an abundant board and calls her children to eat and give thanks to their creator and hers.

"The waters of Duxbury Bay, placid and gleaming with the hazy sunlight of the Indian summer, reflects the sails of a dozen or more boats lazily gliding in from Plymouth, from Marshfield, from Scituate, and even from Barnstable and Sandwich, for the children of the Pilgrims have not yet outgrown the family love and interest that bound their fathers in so close a tie, and the Robinsons, children of the good pastor, who so loved and so cruelly misjudged our Captain, have come from the Cape to the wedding of his son, bringing with them little Mercy, to whom Standish left 'E3 to her whom I tenderly love for her grandfathers sake.'

"Yes this is the wedding day of Josiah Standish and Mary Dingley, whose parents have generously consented to bring their daughter to Duxbury and let the marriage take place in her future home as the captain had requested; and now that he has given his consent, the old man gives his heart to the plan, and sends his boat with John Haward or Hobomok, laden with invitations to the old friends whom in these latter days he has almost churlishly avoided."



RESIDENCE OF REV. SAMUEL DINGLEY, GLOUCESTER, ENGLAND.
 BRASS OF MARGARET DYNELEY.
 SEAT OF DINGLEY FAMILY IN ENGLAND—MAIN ENTRANCE.
 CORNER OF TOWER.

LIBRARY
NO. 100
1000

Then Jane Austin tells of the simple ceremony:

"The brief and bald civil service soon was said, the hearty salutes bestowed, and the sturdy hand-shaking over; then Governor Bradford, with an air at once paternal and courtly, led the bride to the head of the principal table and the feast, upon which the skill of a select committee of old friends has expended itself, began.

"But at last all was over; the hunter's moon whose culmination had fixed the date of the wedding, hung glorious in Heaven, shedding almost the light of day; the neighbor's horses were saddled and pillioned, and the boats of those who came from farther afield were manned and ready," etc.

Thus Mary Dingley and Josiah, son of Captain Myles Standish, were married, but the joy of that day was turned into sorrow. Mary (Dingley) Standish died seven months after her wedding day; and it is she who is the dear daughter-in-law, beside whose body, together with that of his dear daughter Lora, Captain Myles Standish directed in his will he should be buried. ¹

Jacob Dingley, of Marshfield, only son of John living to manhood (born in 1642 and died in 1691) succeeded to the occupancy of the homestead, having married Elisabeth Newton. They had eight children—two sons and six daughters; Mary, born in 1667, who died unmarried; Joseph, born in 1672, who left no sons; Hannah, born in 1676, who married Michael Ford; Alice, born in 1678, who married Joseph Adams; Elisabeth, born in 1681, who married Philip Delana; Sarah, born in 1684, who married Elnathan Fish; Abigail, born in 1687, who married Robert Waterman; and John, born in 1670, who is the common ancestor of all the Dingleys in the United States.

John Dingley, second son of Jacob and grandson of the first John (born in 1670, died in 1763), married Sarah Porter January 27, 1702, she having been born in 1680. They had six children—two sons and four daughters: Jacob, born October 31st, 1708; John, born August 13th, 1706; who married Kessiah Thomas; Sarah, born in 1709, who married Joseph Hewett; Martha, born in 1713; Ann, born in 1716, who married Jacob Pillsbury; and Elisabeth, born in 1723, who married John Sherman.

John Dingley, the father, died December 12, 1763, age almost ninety-four, his wife, Sarah, having died March 8, 1741, aged sixty-one.

John Dingley, the son, remained on the ancestral homestead and married Kessiah Thomas. He died in 1779, and his wife a year earlier. They had six children, three daughters and three sons: John, who died young; Thomas, born in 1731; and Jabez, born in 1735. Jabez settled on the homestead where his grandson, Isaac S. Dingley, resided for many years. Thomas removed to Hallowell, Maine.

Jacob Dingley of Duxbury, the oldest son of John and Sarah Porter Dingley (born in 1703, died in 1799), married Mary Holmes, and settled in the northern part of Duxbury, near the Marshfield line. They had six children, three sons and three daughters: Abner, born January 21, 1732, who married Ruth Bryant; Mary, born in 1735, who married Simeon Cook; Sarah, born in 1742, Abigail, born in 1746; Jacob, born February 25, 1727; and Joseph, born November 23, 1729.

Jacob Dingley died December 4, 1792, at the age of 89, and his wife, Mary, in 1797, at the age of ninety-seven.

Abner Dingley, son of Jacob, had a son, Amasa, born in 1760, and graduated at Harvard college in 1785, who settled as a physician in New York City, and

1—There were two families of Standish—Standish of Standish, and Standish of Duxbury—both originally from the same stock, and both in Lancashire. Such families as the Standishes of Duxbury and the Dingleys of Charlton were apart from the common run of men, and would be more or less in communication with each other all over the country. If they did not know each other personally before they went to America they knew of each other. They would be so in touch with each other that I have no doubt the projects of Miles Standish were heard of at Charlton.

The marriage of Standish of Duxbury and the daughter of a Dingley of Charlton would be distinctly fitting. That John Dingley was a farmer and a blacksmith was no more than saying he was an emigrant. Even now many well born men qualify themselves for emigration by learning a handicraft or two.—[Rev. Samuel R. Dingley.]

died of yellow fever; and also a son Abner, born in 1761; Nathaniel B., born in 1764; and Charles. The son Abner removed to Weston, New York with his sons, Mason, Warren and Amasa; and Abner and Nathaniel B. removed to Winslow, Maine. Joseph, son of Jacob, had two sons, Abner and Joseph.

Jacob Dingley 3rd, of Duxbury, son of Jacob and Mary Holmes Dingley (born in 1737 and died probably about 1770), married first Desire Phillips by whom he had William, born in 1749 and several other children. His second wife was Susannah Fuller, by whom he had Elkanah, who died at sea; Levi, who married Hannah Peterson, and removed to Harpswell, Maine, probably about 1763; Jacob; Desire; Susannah; Ezra; John, who married Lydia Peterson and removed to Bowdoin, Maine; and Mary. Jacob Dingley's third wife was Alethea Fullerton Ford, by whom he had Joseph and Abner. Abner died early and Joseph had three children, Joseph, Hannah and Esther.

William Dingley, son of Jacob and Desire Phillips Dingley (born in 1749, died in 1813), married Sarah Jordan.

CHAPTER IV.

William Dingley, the first of the family to locate in Maine, and the great-grandfather of Nelson Dingley Jr., moved from Duxbury, Massachusetts, to Cape Elizabeth, Maine, about 1773. The town of Cape Elizabeth was only eight years old, having been set off from Falmouth (now Portland) in 1765. He was only twenty-four years old when he located here. He had inherited from his ancestors and acquired through experience a hatred of England and a love for the new republic that was struggling for existence. The very year he moved from Duxbury, Massachusetts, to the new Maine colony of Cape Elizabeth, the famous "Boston Tea-party" was held. Two years later, when William was twenty-six, "The midnight ride of Paul Revere," immortalized by the poet Longfellow (a native of Portland, Maine) had fired his patriotic heart.

The battle of Lexington sounded the note of alarm throughout the colony. News of this conflict reached Falmouth and Cape Elizabeth on the 20th of April; and on the 31st, these towns sent out a strong company. Every man was ready to pledge his life, his fortune, and his sacred honor, in defense of the liberties of America.

William Dingley took part in these patriotic proceedings, and helplessly witnessed the burning of Falmouth by the British October 17th, 1775. Promptly at nine o'clock the signal of attack was given and the red flag of British vengeance was unfurled. It was a beautiful autumnal morning, with a cloudless sky, a gentle breeze and an invigorating atmosphere. Falmouth was beautifully situated on the southern slope of a hill facing the bay. It was the largest and richest town in the state. There were four hundred dwelling houses, each with its garden. There were churches, a library, and several public buildings. For nine hours the British stormed and shelled the doomed city. The torch was applied and the place became a roaring volcano. It was an awful spectacle. Four hundred and fourteen buildings were destroyed and the city laid in ashes. It was a most atrocious crime committed to punish the inhabitants of Falmouth for daring to thwart the British monopoly of manufactures and trade.

Thus William Dingley could not help being an ardent patriot. He was a loyal supporter of George Washington; and when a call was made for troops to defend the coast of Maine, companies were raised at Falmouth, Elizabeth and Boothbay. The dreadful conflict continued. The unfortunate settlers in the towns along the shore were tortured and killed by the British. The coast was ravaged by the cruel and blood thirsty red-coats. This led many settlers to push further back into the wilderness, and the interior towns of Maine were established. Lord Cornwallis, on the 27th of October, 1781, surrendered at Yorktown and the revolution was over.

William Dingley was then thirty-two years old. He had taken an active and honorable part in the struggle for freedom; and with a stout heart and strong hand he started out to make his own way in this new republic of which he was an humble but loyal citizen. He was married at Cape Elizabeth to Sarah Jordan, and to them were born eight children; Jeremiah, born at Cape Elizabeth, January 14, 1779; William, born in 1776; Abigail, who married James Jordan of

Lewiston; Polly, who married Samuel Wagg of Danville, one of the earliest settlers in that section; Lucy, who married John Penley, a descendant of Captain John Penley and for several years a selectman of Danville; Esther, who married David Crockett of Danville; and Sarah and Susannah, who successively married Matthias Vickery Jr., of Danville. (Matthias Vickery Sr., is remembered as a very religious man, and in 1808 he was appointed on a committee of three in the town of Danville "to expend \$80 voted by the town for the support of gospel preachers"). Matthias Jr., married Sarah Dingley who bore him eight children. Of the two sons, only one, Jeremiah, lived to perpetuate the family name.

Sarah Jordan, the good and faithful wife of William Dingley, came from a family of patriots. They originally settled on Cape Elizabeth opposite Falmouth. Humphrey Jordan served honorably in the war of the revolution and in the war of 1812 James Jordan, brother of Humphrey, married Polly, daughter of William and Sarah Jordan Dingley.

William Dingley lived on Cape Elizabeth ten years after the treaty of Paris was signed and the revolutionary army was disbanded. In 1793 at the age of forty-four he moved his family to the town of Danville (now Auburn, Androscoggin, then Cumberland county), and took up a farm in the southeasterly part of that town.


When William Dingley moved to Danville or what was formerly known as Pejepscot, the prolonged litigation over boundaries was not settled; in fact the town of Pejepscot was not incorporated by the general court of Massachusetts until 1814, two years after William died; and the name was not changed to Danville until 1819, seven years after his death.

The early records of this town relate almost exclusively to the making of highways. In 1802, nine years after William located in Danville the first committees were appointed to lay out roads. In the building and repairing of these roads home labor was employed; and in this work of internal improvement William was very active.

The Province of Maine had been a county of Massachusetts since 1653 under the name of Yorkshire. Two delegates were sent to the general court. The people of the province had consented to this in order that they might obtain better protection against the Indians. But now that the Indian wars were over, movements were set on foot for a separation. These movements were carried on intermittently for more than a score of years; but the citizens of Pejepscot took a rather languid interest, if we may judge of the number of them who came out to vote on this question. In 1807 no votes were cast in favor of separation. On another occasion thirty votes, and on still another sixty-seven votes were cast for separation.

The citizens of this town first took part in national affairs in 1808, fifteen years after William Dingley located there. He was fifty-nine years old and being an ardent Federalist, was opposed to the administration of President Jefferson. The town was agitated over the embargo, and Squire Giddings wrote in his diary: "The curse of non-intercourse and embargo measures are felt in every family and continue in prospect with other calamities. May God in His mercy cause what is best to take place."

William died in September, 1812, at the age of sixty-three, three months after war had been declared with England, and two months before the people of his town had elected a Democrat to the general court of Massachusetts by a majority of six and approved of the war.



DINGLEY HOMESTEAD, D'URHAM, MAINE
MR. DINGLEY'S MOTHER. MR. DINGLEY'S FATHER.
LAMBERT HOMESTEAD, DURHAM, MAINE, WHERE NELSON DINGLEY
JR. WAS BORN.

ARY
X
IONS

CHAPTER V.

The story of the early settlement of what is now the state of Maine, is one of suffering and hardship. Hostile Indians and malaria from the White Pine Swamps were foes difficult to overcome. But these pioneers were made of hardy stuff; and as the years rolled by they partook more and more of the rugged qualities of the land and climate. The rivers were the highways. Not even a line of spotted trees indicated a land-tract. On the banks and margins of the watercourses were found the pioneer homes—simple structures of logs reared from the butts of ancient trees fallen by the pioneer's axe on the spot where they were cut down for a clearing. The walls were covered with bark or thatched. The inclosed earth was excavated for a cellar. The excavation was then planked over with riven logs of pine; and a trap-door in the center of the flooring led to the cellar, while a primitive ladder afforded the ascent to the garret above. In one corner of the log-walled room was an immense fireplace. The back and one side was built of stone, while a wooden post set the opposite jamb, supporting a horizontal beam for a mantelpiece. On the hearth was an ample store of wood, while a blazing fire illuminated the whole interior. Here the sturdy pioneers reared their families and laid the foundation of a grand and noble state.

The lumber and fur trades were valuable and largely extended. Money was scarce; commerce was harter. The cotton and linen goods used were largely, if not wholly, the productions of the mothers and daughters at the home fire-side, while the tanned hides of the deer, moose, etc., formed an important factor in making the clothing of the men. Industry, temperance and economy were the leading characteristics of this generation. In those rough pioneer homes dwelt a virtuous and Godly people. They trusted in an all-wise Providence. Trials and unlooked for calamities overtook them but their sublime faith was not shaken. In 1785 a freshet swept away all their bridges. In 1791 they were visited by an incursion of grasshoppers that ate the corn and potatoes to the ground. In many fields not one bushel of potatoes was raised. The winters were long and severe. But year after year these pioneers toiled on.

Among the early settlers was William Dingley who, as has already been stated, moved from Cape Elizabeth to Danville (now Auburn), Maine, in 1793. He took up his abode on a farm in the southeasterly part of that town, on the banks of the Androscoggin river at a point still known as Dingley's Ferry. Danville at that time had few settlers. John Merrill located in the westerly part in 1778; True Woodbury a few years later; and James Wagg was living in 1780 on the farm on the river road still occupied by his descendants. William Dingley took up the life of a pioneer, and joined with his neighbors (the nearest probably five miles) in clearing the forests, tilling the soil and educating his children. They all lived in log cabins and suffered the hardships incident to transforming the forest into farms. Plows could not be used because of stumps and logs. The implement most frequently used was a rude hoe of great weight made by the nearest blacksmith. They had no carts. Manure when used was handled with wooden shovels and carried to the fields in hods.

Hay and other crops were dragged to the farms on ox-sleds or else "poled in" by hand. Their heavy scythes were fastened to straight sticks or perhaps to a crooked alder cut in the swamp. Indian corn was their staple food. Their meat was the flesh of the deer and moose, then abundant. Other wild animals of less desirable character were not uncommon. Bears weighing two hundred pounds were frequently killed within a stone's throw of the log cabin. Besides Indian corn their food was bean porridge, bannocks and salt pork. There were no table cloths, knives or forks, cups or saucers. Wooden bowls and wooden spoons were, besides fingers, the prevailing eating utensils. Settles were used in place of chairs. But William Dingley of Danville, Maine, was a sturdy character. He came of sturdy stock.

He was of the sixth generation of Dingleys, resident in this country; and he doubtless moved to Maine from the old homestead in Duxbury, Massachusetts, to occupy the land he had taken in settlement of government paper paid out to revolutionary soldiers. This paper had depreciated so much that "a bushel of it would not buy a breakfast." The only means of giving an equivalent was in the unappropriated lands in the several commonwealths. Massachusetts had plenty of wild lands in the district of Maine and to her surviving soldiers she gave this opportunity of settling "State Lands" where they could establish homes of their own.

Life in Danville from 1798 to 1812, was primitive and yet wholesome and healthful. Both the men and women possessed great strength of body as well as of mind. They were fitting progenitors of the noble sons and daughters who in subsequent years made Maine famous in history. The men of Danville wore trousers of tow cloth in summer, and woollen cloth, deer or moose hide in the colder weather. Their coats were of similar material; while for shirts linen was the staple article. Wool was rare for a long time, because the bears and wolves killed the sheep; but flax grew freely, and thus linen was plentiful. The women had learned to weave on the great hand looms, and so they wove their coarse tow and the finer flax into thick cloths for the wear of men and boys and into sheets and towels for family use, while they produced a finer cloth woven in colored checks for their own and their daughters' wear on Sundays and social occasions. "Spinning bees" and "wool breakings" were held for spinning and carding. When the work was done the men, both young and old, came in; and the affair usually closed with simple dances and merry plays.

The dress of the women was largely of home-made materials of finer quality and finish than that of the men.

The constant strain of effort in clearing up this new country, affected in a marked degree the social life of the people. Holidays of other than religious observance, were practically unknown. Festivals of any sort were rare indeed. However neighborhood gatherings for social intercourse, were frequent. "Raising bees," "Quilting bees," and "Husking bees" were especially popular. These were usually held moonlight evenings, and the tender and loving hearts of the youths and maidens were frequently given to each other on these romantic occasions. Perhaps the comely daughters of William Dingley—Abigail, Polly, Lucy, Esther, Sarah and Susannah, lost their hearts and found their happiness at some of these bees.

Informal social visits of neighbor upon neighbor were not infrequent; and the good wives would spend an afternoon with each other and stay to tea, carrying perhaps with them their own cups and saucers, and their wheels and distaffs or other implements, that the hours might be improved; for these good women were never idle. The town story-tellers spun their yarns and at nine o'clock sharp, good-nights were said, for in those days the rule was:

Early to bed and early to rise

Make a man healthy, wealthy and wise.

Such was the life prevailing at Danville when William Dingley lived there with his good wife Sarah. Their lives were full of toil and hardship; but the earnestness and persistency of purpose which helped them conquer the wilderness, descended to their children and their children's children and gave to them the qualities that make noble men and women. From these hard conditions came the physical, mental and moral sturdiness and the self-reliance that characterized the life of Nelson Dingley Jr.

William Dingley and his wife Sarah lie buried on the banks of the Andros-

coggin river, near the site of their old home. Their six daughters married happily and well, and lived near by. Their second son, Jeremiah, perpetuated the family name.

CHAPTER VI.

Jeremiah, otherwise known as "Squire" Dingley, the second and only surviving son of William Dingley, was twenty-six years old when he took unto himself a wife. May 12, 1805, he married Lucy Garcelon, and settled on the old homestead at the Ferry on the banks of the Androscoggin river. Andrew R. Giddings, Job Lane and Benning Wentworth were the selectmen of the town. (John Jordan, a relative of Sarah Jordan, wife of William Dingley, was a selectman at Danville several years, first in 1804.) Benning Wentworth was clerk. The state of Maine, which had developed wonderfully for ten years, now had a population of about 155,000. Waterville, where Nelson Dingley Jr. spent much of his student life forty-five years later, had been incorporated two years before. Lewiston, where Jeremiah Dingley Sr. found his first wife Lucy, was ten years old. In this year Oxford county, the home of many of Maine's most distinguished sons, was organized. Jeremiah was thirty-three years old when war was declared against Great Britain in June, 1812. He, like his honored father, was an ardent patriot, a stern gentleman of the old school and a conservative but public-spirited citizen. He was deeply interested in the development of the country and took an active part in politics. The war of 1812 over, Danville took part in the great demonstrations of joy that swept over the whole country. The great political question of the hour was the proposition to separate Maine from Massachusetts. After several trials, in 1819, the general court of Massachusetts formally declared the district of Maine ready to assume the duties and responsibilities of statehood. March 3, 1820, the district of Maine became the state of Maine; and two years later Jeremiah Dingley was first elected to the board of selectmen of Danville. He was forty-three years old and reckoned one of the shrewdest and soundest men in that section. He was thus honored by his fellow-townsmen for eight years successively.

Squire Dingley was a blacksmith, and like all his neighbors, and ancestors, a farmer. Of the 148 heads of families in 1830, 145 were farmers. The men and the women toiled from sunrise to sunset. They journeyed on horseback; the pillions for ladies' seats.

Lucy, the first wife of Jeremiah, was the daughter of Rev. James Garcelon of Lewiston, one of the selectmen of that town in its early days. They lived happily on the old homestead at the ferry and had ten children—five sons and five daughters—Jordan, born April 2, 1806, who married Jane Gilpatrick; Julia A., born July 16, 1807, who married Socrates Dow; Nelson, born November, 15, 1808, who married Jane Lambert; James, born January 7, 1811, who married Betsey Blethen as his first wife, and widow Howard as his second; William, born March 27, 1814, who married Maria Blethen; Nancy, born June 12, 1816, who married William Brewster; Lucy, born August 12, 1819, who married Isaac Lambert; Jeremiah Jr., born April 13, 1822, who married Minerva Williams as his first wife and Ruth P. McKenney as his second wife; Sarah Elizabeth, born August 2, 1824, and Susan G., born April 2, 1825, who married Cornelius Stackpole.

Their third child (born November 15, 1809) was named Nelson and was the father of Nelson Dingley Jr. All the sons married well and happily, and lived



MRS. SALOME DINGLEY, WIFE OF NELSON DINGLEY JR.

PL
HART
NXX
ACTIONS

to be honored and respected citizens. James was a selectman in 1848 and later. Jeremiah Jr., subsequently lived in Auburn, became prominent in politics and business, was a loyal and ardent supporter of his nephew, Nelson Dingley Jr., and in February, 1890, one month after the death of his honored relative, passed from this life leaving a good name and a large fortune. The daughters of Jeremiah Sr. all but Sarah Elisabeth, married well and left their mark on the history of this community.

Squire Dingley spent the most useful years of his life (1830-1850) during an interesting period of Maine's history. The state was developing rapidly; the capitol was located at Augusta in 1833; the government was being formed, and trade and commerce were extending.

The Aroostook war to settle the boundary between Maine and Canada, aroused the people of Danville. Politics ran high; and on all national questions Squire Dingley and his sons were always against the extension of slavery and in favor of a strong central government. Wendell Phillips, William Lloyd Garrison and Henry Clay were the idols of Squire Dingley.

He was a blacksmith and a farmer, as were also nearly all of his ancestors. He resided on the ferry homestead till his marriage to the Widow Jordan in 1837, his first wife Lucy Garcelon having died August 6, 1831. With his second wife he removed to Durham, the adjoining town south on the banks of the Androscoggin river. Here he lived for many years, finally removing to Auburn, Maine, opposite Lewiston, where he died February 14, 1890, at the age of ninety years.

Nelson Dingley, the third child of Squire Dingley, was born at the old homestead in Danville. He was brought up by his good mother Lucy as all children were then brought up—to work. He received a baptismal name of Nelson from England's great naval hero, who had but recently lost his life in the battle of Trafalgar. His mother died while he was young; but her noble and ambitious soul had inspired Nelson to acquire all the advantages the times afforded. He was reared on the farm with only the usual opportunities for schooling afforded by the country schools. He was the architect of his own fortune, beginning life, as he has so often said, with a capital of 50c, and, as the long life and consistent proof of industry showed, won his way to success in every enterprise in life which he undertook. His first venture of his own was at the age of nineteen, when, a mere boy off the farm, he traveled with a stock of goods, by team, over a large part of the state of Maine, making his venture profitable, both in experience and in money. He was a typical Yankee, sharp in a trade and self-reliant.

In 1831, when he was twenty-two years old, he married Jane Lambert, daughter of Isaac and Mary Strout Lambert of Durham.

Jane Lambert was also twenty-two years of age. She was a smart, active girl, with dark brown hair and keen eyes. She devoted her summers to teaching school. She had a strong character and was energetic and ambitious and educated far beyond her day. She came of good old Revolutionary stock, her grandfather being Captain Joshua Strout, a native of Cape Elizabeth and a pioneer in Royalsborough (Durham) since 1771. Her mother, Mary, a daughter of the Knightly Captain, married Isaac Lambert an early settler in Durham, one of the devout christians of the town, one of the founders of the first Baptist church in that place, and chosen and ordained its first deacon.

In 1853, Nelson Dingley Jr. in his diary thus wrote of his grandfather Lambert:

"My grandfather Lambert was one of those stern old Puritans who settled in the country when it was an almost unbroken wilderness. By his own hands he had acquired a respectable property, and in the language of the world was well-to-do. Brought up in all the rigidity of early New England customs, he had an honest horror of everything pertaining to fashion and luxuries. His Bible was his guide and rule of action; and a living honestly acquired was his ultimate thule of happiness."

Thus in Jane Lambert was united the sturdy and aggressive qualities of a soldier and the sweet and lofty attributes of a devout follower of the Nazarine.

Jane Lambert was a remarkable woman and many stories are even now told in Durham of her exceptional qualities.

The devoted young couple, Nelson Dingley and Jane Lambert Dingley, took up their abode in the town of Durham in 1831, in the old Lambert homestead, and gave to each other that sweet mutual support and confidence that marked their entire wedded life. She was a loving wife and a devoted mother; he was a loving husband and a proud father.

Of his parents Nelson Dingley Jr. wrote in 1853 thus:


"Under the staid Puritanic rule my mother lived, early taught that each one was required to labor with his own hands; that industry was the indispensable requisite for this world, she had always done whatever was to be done. She had spent no time in the fashionable frivolities of this day, but practically qualified herself to enter on life's sea. Labor was no disgrace to her mind but an enjoyment for our natures. With few advantages she had stored her mind with knowledge, rather above the average for those days. She drank deep enough of the fountain to feel its value, to encourage her children. Her life passed smoothly, with no angry waves; in the same spirit she had linked her destiny with another—the spirit of self-reliance. Under about the same influence my father was educated. Work was an element of every day lesson. Under the influence of God-fearing parents his mind was formed. Of a stern, persevering nature, he triumphed over the difficulties of life, and sailed smoothly over the waste of waters. By his own exertions he rapidly rose both in the estimation of his neighbors and in property. Kind and affectionate almost to a fault he was respected by all, lived happy, surrounded by all the blessings of life, and I trust will die happy and be gathered at the right hand of God."

In 1832 Durham, Maine, was a thriving town. The tide of business seemed to flow in that direction, and many thought it would sometime be a large city. As a manufacturing town it ranked with the leading communities in the state. Saw and grist mills were on every stream. A steam saw mill, a tannery, a chair factory, a shipyard, made the town lively and interesting and gave promise of a great future.

To this place Nelson Dingley Sr. moved. He abandoned farming and set up a general store. This was popularly known as "Dingley's Store," and here gathered all the local politicians and farmers to discuss the latest questions of the day and spin yarns more or less truthful. It was a typical country store, with an old red-hot stove blazing in the winter and a number of barrels and boxes utilized as resting places for loafers and flies, in the summer time. National, state and local politics, as well as temperance were discussed. Nelson Dingley Sr., was an ardent Whig and a strong defender of the Maine liquor law. Durham and Dingley's store were famous for miles around.

Here Nelson Dingley Jr. was born February 15, 1833. The leading men of the town were James Strout, Jonathan Strout, Jacob Strout, (all relatives of Jane Lambert Dingley, wife of Nelson Dingley Sr.), James Newell, Jacob Herrick, David Douglass, and William Newell Jr. The Dingleys and the Lamberts were Baptists at this time; and in 1833, seven years after Nelson Dingley Sr. moved away from Durham, the first Baptist church was organized there. Some of the men and women on the first roll of membership were: Isaac Lambert (father of Jane Lambert Dingley), Jeremiah Dingley (father of Nelson Dingley Sr.), William Dingley, brother of Jeremiah Dingley; Isaac Lambert Jr., Mary Lambert, Lucy Lambert and Maria Dingley. In 1851, this church was at the height of its prosperity; but soon after began to decline. Of the last four deacons, two were Isaac Lambert and William Dingley, while William Dingley was superintendent of the Sunday school.

Durham probably takes its name from the county of that name in England, once the residence of the royal family. The name Roysborough was given to this new township laid out in 1768, because Col. Isaac Royall who emigrated from England in 1781 and settled in Medford, Massachusetts, was one of the proprietors. The town is located on the west bank of the Androscoggin river. The surface of the land is undulating, with a slope in the north towards the river. In the early days before the white man trod these shores the wigwags of the Indians dotted the banks of the Androscoggin. The Anasagunticooks, or Androscoggin Indians, as they were subsequently called, had an encampment at Brunswick, a few miles below Durham. During King Philip's war in 1675 and '76 they frequently met here to plan their cruel and barbarous attacks. King William's war followed and the natives of the Androscoggin exhibited so much



FRANK L. DINGLEY, BROTHER OF NELSON DINGLEY JR.

ferocity, that the government of Massachusetts sent out Major Church to capture or kill Worumbes, the Sagamore who succeeded the cruel Tarumkin. Worumbes's fort was on the upper Androscoggin. Church says in his history of this campaign that "we marched that day above the middle falls (Lisbon Falls) about twenty miles." His route must have been directly through what is now the site of Durham.

Many years have passed since the last wandering Anasagunticook occupied the valley of this river where they were once so numerous, and the name is now known only in history.

After the close of the war of 1812 intemperance increased alarmingly in the district of Maine. It was no uncommon thing to see all the members of a respectable family more or less under the influence of liquor. After the state was organized in 1820 the people took alarm, and steps were taken to check the growing evil. In nearly every town itinerant preachers talked on the curse of rum. Temperance revivals were held and temperance societies with the motto "Temperance, Humanity and Progress," were formed in every town. The town of Durham took an active part in this movement, and here Nelson Dingley and Jane Lambert Dingley instilled into their children the foundation principles of temperance. The proud wife and mother, inspired by this wave of temperance, made her sons valiant knights in the long fight against this great evil. The movement resulted, in 1846, in the first law prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors. The part Jane Lambert Dingley's eldest son took in this great drama, is told elsewhere in this work.

Two sons were born to Nelson and Jane Lambert Dingley—Nelson Jr., born in Durham, Maine, February 16, 1832; and Frank L., born in Unity, Maine, February 7, 1840.

Jane Lambert Dingley, the loving and devoted mother of Nelson Dingley Jr., the distinguished statesman, departed this life December 2, 1871, age sixty-two years. Of this event Congressman Dingley penned the following, which was published in the Lewiston Journal of December 3, 1871:

"Thanksgiving day her children and her grandchildren, as were their custom, assembled at the parental home which was ever made sweet and attractive by her presence. Gathered around the Thanksgiving table which she had so bountifully supplied, all united in thanks to the Giver of all good, and participated with her in all the enjoyment of the family reunion. Not one of us thought as we separated on that night that it was the last time we should all ever meet again on earth."

After describing the scene of her death he continues:

"Her children had been summoned, but when we arrived our mother was dead. Her face wore the same pleasing expression it was wont to wear in life and it was not till we kissed the lips whose touch from infant years had ever been so sweet to ours, that we could believe our blessed mother was no longer here."

"Dearest mother, no more shall we meet thee on earth. When our life work is done we hope to meet thee in that blessed land of which you so often spoke, and in the presence of that Saviour in whom you trusted. Till then, we, thy children, and our dear father, who deeply mourns the loss of a loving and devoted wife, have the precious legacy of thy sainted memory. The memory of thy tender love and unwearying care, thy uncounted deeds of affection, thy ever faithful counsel, thy kind remembrance of those in affliction, and thy deeds of charity and sympathy—crowds upon us with its wonted smile. You will be missed in the circle in which you moved, but above all in that home which for so many years your presence made radiant with joy, and most of all by the bereaved husband and children."

"Dearest mother, farewell, till we, too, are called."

Nelson Dingley Sr. lived an active and honorable life. In 1833 he moved with his wife and infant child to Parkman in Piscataquis county, Maine. A little farm; afterwards a store and a hotel; a few acres extending into more; patient days full of hard work often extending late into the evening hours; the zealous consecrated labor for his little family and the ambition to get on in the world—these repeat the biography of this New Englander, zealous chiefly because he desired his children to have a larger life than his own could ever be.

Here they lived until the autumn of 1833, when he removed to Unity in Waldo county, Maine. Here he opened a general store and also engaged in

farming until 1854 when he removed to Auburn, Maine. In 1853 he was elected to the state senate as a Whig in a strongly Democratic county.

In Auburn Nelson Dingley's life was all that the life of any active man of position, character and business reputation should be. He was never idle for a single hour. He was a man of keen judgment and rare integrity. He was active, honest, industrious, sagacious, helpful, thoughtful, considerate and kind. Endowed with the kindest of humor, noted for his jest and joke, he never injured the feelings of others.

He took a keen and active interest in passing events until the last, and was proud of the accomplishments of his distinguished son. His home life was singularly calm and peaceful. He viewed all things from the high level of a Christian manhood.


He passed from life August 2, 1897, at the home of his second son, Frank L. Dingley, in Auburn, Maine. He lies buried on the bank of the Androscoggin river beside his devoted wife and his distinguished son.

It will thus be seen that Nelson Dingley Jr. came of exceptionally good stock, his ancestors dating back to the 12th century when the family name first appears in the parish of Dingley in Northamptonshire, England. The Dingleys in England and America appear to have been honest, sturdy people. They have in each generation played an important part in history; but under the divine dispensation of God, it was left for Nelson Dingley Jr. seven hundred years after the earliest recorded history of the Dingley family name, to make the name of Dingley famous throughout the civilized world. 1

1—Much of the biographical matter in these chapters relating to the Dingleys in America is obtained from an autobiography of Nelson Dingley Jr., written and published by him in 1874. The dedication of this little volume on its title page is as follows:

"To my Dear Father, whose life is still graciously spared, and the memory of my Dear Mother, who has passed to that better land where I hope to join her when my life-work is done."

Miss M. A. Thomas of Marshfield, Massachusetts, furnished Congressman Dingley at that time with some interesting data concerning his family, much of which is given in these pages.



GARCELON'S FERRY, ANDROSCOGGIN RIVER.
LAST RESTING PLACE OF NELSON DINGLEY JR., AUBURN.
OLD DINGLEY BURYING GROUND, DURHAM.



CPSIA information can be obtained
at www.ICGtesting.com
Printed in the USA
LVHW081549291221
707456LV00002B/93



This work has been selected by scholars as being culturally important, and is part of the knowledge base of civilization as we know it. This work was reproduced from the original artifact, and remains as true to the original work as possible. Therefore, you will see the original copyright references, library stamps (as most of these works have been housed in our most important libraries around the world), and other notations in the work.

This work is in the public domain in the United States of America, and possibly other nations. Within the United States, you may freely copy and distribute this work, as no entity (individual or corporate) has a copyright on the body of the work.

As a reproduction of a historical artifact, this work may contain missing or blurred pages, poor pictures, errant marks, etc. Scholars believe, and we concur, that this work is important enough to be preserved, reproduced, and made generally available to the public. We appreciate your support of the preservation process, and thank you for being an important part of keeping this knowledge alive and relevant.

